United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2013 No. 18

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 7, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2013

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

God of the Universe, thank You for giving us another day.

As the Democratic Caucus leaves for its retreat, bless each Member with skills and the vision to fashion pathways to bringing about what is needed for the benefit of our Nation.

Bless the Republican Conference, which remains at the Capitol, with the same gifts, consistent with their own defining skills and vision.

In Your wisdom, bless both parties with the grace that is needed to work together to benefit our people. May we all be faithful stewards of the Nation bequeathed to us by our American ancestors.

Please keep all who work for the people's House in good health, that they may faithfully fulfill the great responsibility given them in their service to the work of the Capitol.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALBERG led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches from each side of the aisle.

A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Hardworking taxpayers in Michigan and across the country live within their means in large part because they create responsible budgets. It's only natural that they expect the same from their government. A balanced budget is important to those of us who want to protect and save Medicare and Social Security. It's also important to the young workers and families who cannot afford to see their taxes go up. Unfortunately, the Senate and President have repeatedly failed at this basic duty.

Last year, the President sent Congress a budget that never balanced, while the Senate hadn't the courage to even produce a budget in nearly 4 years. However, since the American people entrusted the Republicans with the majority in the House, my colleagues and I have twice passed a responsible budget to address our mounting debt and promote a healthy economy.

Today, we'll also pass the Require a PLAN Act, which would obligate the President to submit a budget that balances within 10 years, or provide a supplemental budget plan identifying when the Federal budget would balance.

We believe there is a better way to tackle our Nation's debt than higher taxes and the President's sequester. Together we can produce solutions that get our debt crisis under control. Our neighbors and our families deserve our best effort.

NATIONAL BLACK HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, February 7, is the 13th National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day.

We represent 14 percent of the 1.1 million Americans living with HIV, and account for 44 percent of all new infections. My district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, carries a disproportionate burden of this disease.

From 2001 to 2005, the incidence of HIV infection in the territory increased by 19.4 percent, and has increased every year since 1998. In 2008,

Printed on recycled paper.

HRSA estimated the combined HIV infection rate of people living with AIDS in the territory to be 1 percent of our population. And CDC reports that the Virgin Islands has one of the highest newly identified confirmed HIV positivity rates among African Americans in this country.

Most, if not all of us, know someone who is living with HIV or has died from AIDS. Today no one needs to die. Let's talk openly with our partners, family, and friends; let's get educated; let's get tested; and let's reduce stigma and discrimination.

Tomorrow and every day, we will do more than commemorate those we have lost. We will rededicate ourselves to the work ahead. We can beat this disease. We can win this fight. Together, we can end this epidemic.

CONGRATULATING ALLEN HIGH SCHOOL

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Allen High School in my district for a recent victory on December 22. The Allen Eagles won the Texas State Championship with a score of 35–21 against Houston Lamar. Back in 2008, the Allen Eagles clinched their first Class 5A Division I State title, and now in 2012 they've done it again.

After completing their incredible 15–1 season, the Allen Eagles have officially been named to the eighth annual MaxPreps Tour of Champions. In the past nine seasons, Tom Westerberg, head coach of the Eagles, has led his team to two State titles with a record of 102 wins to 16 losses. It comes as no surprise that he was named 2012 Dallas Area Coach of the Year.

The Allen Eagles are known to be a team with heart, and it's now proven they have the heart of a champion. Congratulations, Allen Eagles, on a tremendous season. Way to represent the city of Allen and continuing the storied tradition of great high school football in north Texas. God bless you. I salute you.

INTRODUCING THE GOVERNMENT WASTE REDUCTION ACT

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise to talk about the first piece of legislation I am introducing as a Member of Congress.

Like many people across Illinois, I learned at a young age that balancing the family pocketbook and living within our means is a question of values. I want to work together on commonsense solutions that reduce the deficit while preserving the important services on which so many people rely.

The bill I'm introducing today does just that. It is called the Government Waste Reduction Act. This bill moves forward on recommendations the Government Accountability Office made that would reduce duplication in government, save taxpayer money, enhance revenue, and root out waste.

It establishes the independent Government Waste Reduction Board, tasked with recommending legislative proposals that implement these cost-cutting measures and sending them to Congress.

For example, the Federal Government has 47 job training programs, 44 of which overlap. Simply consolidating programs that overlap can save tens of billions of dollars, while not impacting program quality.

Commonsense proposals to cut waste out of government already exist, but they are meaningless and save nothing unless we implement them. My bill will serve as a starting point to lower our deficits by tens of billions of dollars in a responsible, commonsense way that protects the middle class.

MOX IS A NATIONAL ASSET

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, yesterday I sent a letter to the President to encourage him to support the MOX project, the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, located in Aiken, Barnwell, and Allendale Counties of South Carolina.

This facility at the Savannah River plays a vital role in allowing the United States to fulfill our international nonproliferation obligations by turning nuclear bombs into energy. The President has always supported this facility, which was initiated in the Clinton administration.

The facility is over 50 percent completed and promotes our national security. Today's letter is supported by Members from both sides of the aisle, which proves this issue is not partisan politics, but one of grave national security concern. It is my hope, as customers are identified, that the project will be completed, which supports environmental cleanup efforts at the Savannah River site.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 0910

NATIONAL BLACK HIV/AIDS AWARENESS DAY

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. I rise as founding cochair of the bipartisan Congressional Black HIV/AIDS Caucus to mark National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day. Tomorrow, individuals and organizations across the Nation, including in my own 13th Congressional District of California, will organize and advocate for HIV testing and treatment.

In the United States, African Americans remain disproportionately affected by HIV/AIDS. This is especially true for young gay and bisexual men of color. While African American teenagers represent 15 percent of teenagers in the United States, they accounted for 69 percent of all cases reported among teenagers in 2010. The same is true for African American women, who accounted for 68 percent of all new HIV cases among women.

Despite the progress we've made in recent years, this Congress has already made unconscionable budget cuts to critical programs that many families and communities rely on. A new analysis by the Foundation for AIDS Research and the National Minority AIDS Council shows, if budget sequestration were to take effect, communities of color would be disproportionately impacted, including more than 6,500 individuals who immediately lose access to HIV treatment.

We must reject these cuts and expand effective prevention, care, and treatment programs so that we can once and for all stamp HIV and AIDS off the face of the Earth.

HONORING FORMER ARMY STAFF SERGEANT CLINTON ROMESHA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, as inadequate as words are in expressing our gratitude to our American heroes who wear the uniform of our armed services, I rise to do my best to pay tribute to one very special soldier from North Dakota.

Former Army Staff Sergeant Clinton Romesha will be presented with the Medal of Honor next Monday by President Obama for ''acts of gallantry and intrepidity,'' becoming only the fourth living recipient for actions in Afghanistan or Iraq. With the help of an assistant gunner, he took out a machine-gun team before sustaining shrapnel from a grenade. The citation recalls his acts of heroism this way:

> Undeterred by his injuries, Staff Sergeant Romesha continued to fight, and upon the arrival of another soldier to aid him and his assistant gunner, he again rushed through the exposed avenue to assemble additional soldiers. With complete disregard for his own safety, he completely exposed himself to heavy enemy fire as he moved confidently about the battlefield engaging and destroying multiple enemy targets.

This young husband and father not only fought the enemy after sustaining his own wounds, he organized air attacks and provided cover while three of his wounded comrades could get to aid, then pushed on to retrieve the bodies of fallen soldiers.

Madam Speaker, I'm honored to serve in this prestigious assembly, always aware I do so because people like

Staff Sergeant Romesha serve me and our Nation in ways we can't even imagine. May God bless Mr. Romesha and his family and all of our American heroes who serve the cause of freedom around the world.

CONGRATULATING THE BALTIMORE RAVENS

(Mr. RUPPERSBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the world champions of football, the Baltimore Ravens. On February 3, the Vince Lombardi Trophy returned home to ''Charm City.'' Like Coach Harbaugh said, the win wasn't pretty, it wasn't perfect, but it was Baltimore.

We overcame the doubts of a Nation. Baltimore was just an afterthought, playing against a 3½-point favorite.

We overcame injury. Bernard Pollard, our safety, played with not one, not two, not three, not four, not five, but six broken ribs throughout the season.

We overcame an agonizing 34-minute delay, when we seemed to lose not only power in the stadium but the wind in our sails.

We overcame a second-half surge that left us screaming at our televisions, from Dundalk to Havre de Grace.

I watched the game with my family and my 92-year-old mother, and even she was fired up. The team stuck together and got it done.

I want to congratulate the owner, Steve Bisciotti, a class act who does so much for our city on and off the field. Also, Ravens President Dick Cass and General Manager Ozzie Newsome, who has the greatest mind in football. And, of course, the players—especially No. 52, Ray Lewis, and No. 5, Joe Flacco, who won the MVP of the game.

Last Sunday, the lights were out in the Superdome for awhile, but at the end of the day, it was just lights out for the 49ers. Baltimore cannot be more proud to welcome our players and the Vince Lombardi Trophy back home.

I also want to say that our leader, NANCY PELOSI, who is homegrown Baltimore, now a 49ers fan, did accept the defeat with her regular class and dignity.

CONGRATULATING THE BALTIMORE RAVENS

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. I rise, Madam Speaker, to congratulate Congressman RUPPERSBERGER and the other members of the Maryland delegation and, more importantly, join them in congratulating the Ravens. They beat a mighty champion at the Super Bowl.

As a proud 49ers fan who grew up on Johnny Unitas in Baltimore and going to those games as a teenager and raising my own children on Joe Montana and Steve Young, you can just imagine how exciting this game was for me.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER quoted Coach Harbaugh. I will quote him in another way. They asked him after the game, Was it hard coaching against your very own brother in the Super Bowl? He said that it was very hard. The only thing that would have been worse is if one of us were not coaching in the Super Bowl.

So while it was hard to lose to the Ravens, it would have been even harder to lose to someone else. If someone had to beat the 49ers, I congratulate the Ravens on a game well played.

I was in the stadium. I wondered who on the Baltimore side decided to pull the plug on the electricity. They were wondering who on the 49ers' side did. In any event, there was good spirit. I think if you were there and you saw that delay in the game and you saw the mood of the people, it was a real tribute to the people of New Orleans, who had extended such gracious hospitality in every way. People were in a good mood and they rode out that time.

I want to join you in commending the owner, Steve Bisciotti, in his leadership of the Ravens, but I also want to acknowledge the wonderful leadership of Art Modell. He passed away in the fall after being such a great leader in the Baltimore community, bringing the Ravens to Baltimore and in being a part of the city in philanthropic and other ways. He was a great man. It was wonderful to see the Ravens and everyone else, including Governor O'Malley and Mayor Rawlings-Blake, with ''Art'' on their lapels throughout the weekend.

So to Art Modell's family, to the ownership of the Ravens, congratulations. To the people of Baltimore, I know how exciting it is and what it means to Baltimore. I extend my congratulations. And I didn't have a bet, because I said while I'm rooting for the 49ers, I would never bet against Baltimore. So congratulations to all concerned.

REQUIRE PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NO DEFICIT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 48 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 444.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly take the chair.

□ 0918

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, February 5, 2013, 30 minutes remained in general debate.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each has 15 minutes remaining.

Who yields time?

□ 0920

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, a family that earns $27,000 but spends $36,000 and has run up a credit card debt of $165,000 is obviously on the brink of financial ruin. Proportionally, that is exactly where our Federal Government is today.

Now, if that family went to see a credit counselor, the first thing he's going to tell them is we've got to sit down and draw up a budget. Now, that family is going to have to make some very difficult choices. It may take several years to work its way back to solvency. But our Senate has not passed a budget in nearly 4 years, and our President has offered only entirely un-serious budgets that continue to spend recklessly and that never balance.

This bill simply requires that if the President can't balance the budget this year, he tell us how long it will take and what needs to be done to do so. We would expect that from any family. We should demand it from our government.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, as we debated yesterday, the bill before us is unfortunately nothing more than a political gimmick at a time when we're facing huge issues with respect to jobs and the economy.

It's very unfortunate that we did not have an opportunity to vote on an amendment that we proposed to replace the sequester—which is now less than a month away and which will do grave economic harm—our proposal to replace that sequester with a balanced mix of cuts and revenue from closing loopholes. But in this body, which says it wants to be transparent in the people's House, we were denied an opportunity to take a vote on something that's very important to the American

people, as opposed to playing the political games we've been playing with this bill.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, the Representative from San Francisco and the daughter of Baltimore, the home of the Super Bowl champions, the Ravens.

Ms. PELOSI. Well, if the Ravens' and the 49ers' fans can come together, hopefully so can the Democrats and the Republicans on an issue of this grave concern to our country, our budget, which should be a statement of our national values. Instead, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN said, we see the Republicans playing games with the budget. Playing games—that's what they have been doing and that's what they continue to do as we go into this spring, when we need to find solutions; playing games that give new meaning to the term ''March Madness'' because that's what will result if we have to face a sequester. It's a very bad idea. A sequester should be out of the question, and we should be talking about how we find a solution instead of a sequester.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN offered a solution. Here we have a debate on the budget, the blueprint for how we go forward. And the Rules Committee, dominated by the Republican majority, has said we won't even let your proposal come to the floor, not in the form of an amendment or a substitute or in any other way. What are they afraid of? They're afraid of common sense because that is what Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal is about.

It recognizes that we need to have spending cuts. In fact, we've already agreed to $1.6 trillion in spending cuts in the Budget Control Act. It recognizes that we must address the entitlement issue. In fact, Democrats have already agreed to more than $1 trillion in Medicare savings to strengthen Medicare and to protect beneficiaries. So with that as a basis, we go forward with the Van Hollen proposal, which is a very commonsense solution. It is a plan to replace sequester. It makes further spending cuts in a responsible way. It ends tax breaks for Big Oil, and it ensures that millionaires pay their fair share. Who could be opposed to that?

So let's get serious. It's time for us to get serious. We have a serious challenge. We should be working in a bipartisan way to find a solution. Instead, again, the Republicans are playing games leading up to what will make ''March Madness'' a term that would be inadequate for the consequences to our children, millions of whom will be affected in terms of their education and their wellbeing; to our seniors, to our veterans, to our safety industry in terms of cops on the beat. The list of cuts across the board and a meat-ax approach with no common sense given to it is ridiculous. It's ridiculous.

Let's stop this march to folly, this ''March Madness.'' Let's get serious. Let's accept the President's challenge that he put forth. If we can't have a big, bold, and balanced solution now, let's at least do something that is balanced and bold as we go forward to the end of the fiscal year, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN has proposed, so that we can do what is right for the American people instead of what is wrong for our economy.

What the Republicans are proposing is a blueprint for a downward spiral in our economy. It's irresponsible. It does not have value in terms of being solution-oriented.

I might add, in conclusion, Madam Chair, that I'm listening attentively to this debate and I hear my colleagues on the Republican side talking about how important it is to reduce the deficit—and we are in total agreement on that subject. I think we have a moral obligation to reduce the deficit. I think we have a moral obligation to create jobs, to put people to work because growth, in addition to spending cuts and revenue increases, growth is what's going to help us reduce the deficit.

But I didn't hear one ''boo'' out of any of the people, not one little hoot, one little peep, or any other sound an endangered species of a deficit hawk would have made during President Bush's term when most of this deficit was amassed—tax cuts for the wealthiest people, which did not create jobs but increased the deficit; giveaways to the pharmaceutical companies with an ill-advised pharmaceutical plan; and two unpaid-for wars. Just not fair to investments that we should be making in America's future, whether it's biomedical research to create cures and to keep America preeminent in terms of science, whether, again, it's invested in the seed corn and the education of our children. The list goes on and on. The list goes on and on of all of the initiatives that are important to growth, to making our future brighter, to keeping America competitive, to keeping America number one.

So I urge a strong rejection of what the Republicans are proposing. It's, frankly, silly and, as I said before, unworthy of the challenge that our country faces and the bipartisan solutions that we should be trying to achieve.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, it is probably appropriate to refocus ourselves on the bill that we're discussing today, that's before us today, H.R. 444. It simply does one thing. It says to the President: when you bring a budget to Congress, tell us when it's going to balance. That's all it does.

Now, the sequester is an important issue, there's no doubt about it. President Obama's sequester is an important issue. House Republicans have passed two times spending reductions that prioritize in a much more responsible way. We agree that it ought to be much more responsible. The ball is in the Senate's court. The ball is in the President's court.

This bill, though, simply says to the President: when you bring your budget to us, just let us know when it balances. That's important because the last four budgets that the President has brought to this House, to this Congress, have never, ever balanced.

I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS).

Mr. DESJARLAIS. I thank my colleague for his leadership on this issue.

This is the fourth time in 5 years that the White House has proven that it does not take trillion-dollar deficits seriously enough to submit a budget on time. In contrast, House Republicans, since taking the majority in 2010, have done that every year and will do so again in just a couple of weeks.

We still do not know when the President plans on actually submitting his budget. When asked, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney said that the administration favors substance over deadlines. Let me translate that for you: they don't have a solution to addressing the Nation's spending and debt crisis.

Today, the House will pass the Require a PLAN Act. I'm hearing comments that this is a gimmick, this is a ploy. Are you kidding me? We need to do our job. The American people get it. They want Congress to work together. They're not in love with Republicans or Democrats right now. They want us to solve this problem.

□ 0930

It's sad that we have to resort to a Require a PLAN Act to get the other side to work with us. Please work with us. We have submitted budgets. We need the Senate to submit a budget. Every missed deadline is a missed opportunity. We need to get serious about spending now. We cannot continue to delay choices that we need to make. We owe it to our future generations.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, for those Members of this body who were not focused on this debate yesterday, let's make a couple of things clear. The President will introduce a budget, he is going to submit a budget, and he has submitted a budget every year. Our Republican colleagues don't like his budget because he takes a balanced approach to reducing the deficit, meaning that in addition to cuts, he also calls for additional revenue from taking away special tax breaks for special interests. That's number one.

Number two, what this bill does is, number one, require the President to submit his budget in a certain way; and number two, it criticizes the President for submitting his budget late.

Again, for those who weren't part of the debate yesterday, the reason the President's budget is late is because we had to pass the fiscal cliff agreement. We didn't get that done until January 2. And I have to say, Madam Chairman, we got it done despite the overwhelming opposition of House Republicans. We were pleased to get the overwhelming support of Senate Republicans, but House Republicans continue

to take the position that they were prepared to go over the fiscal cliff in order to protect tax breaks for very wealthy people.

That's why the President's budget is late, because as any American family knows, if you don't know what revenue is coming in, you can't put together your household budget. We didn't know what kind of revenue was coming in until January 2.

So, with that, Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. LEVIN.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. The Republican mantra is no revenues, cuts at any price, whether it damages health research, our kids' education, our national defense, or our national economy. So beneath their new talk of softening their image remains their hard edge.

Now we're less than a month away from a sequester—$85 billion in arbitrary, across-the-board cuts just in 2013. Just yesterday, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office warned us that allowing the sequester budget cuts to take effect would reduce GDP growth by more than 25 percent this year, wiping out hundreds of thousands of jobs—hundreds of thousands of jobs—and pushing the unemployment rate back up to 8 percent.

So I say to the Republicans, instead of opening your arms to the sequester and risking our Nation's economic recovery, Republicans should be opening their minds to a balanced, bipartisan solution.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, on Monday, the President missed the deadline for submitting his fiscal year 2014 budget. So, unfortunately, we haven't yet seen what the President will propose to address our exploding debt. But if the President's 2014 budget is similar to his plan from last year, it will never achieve balance, not next year, not in 10 years, and not even in 30 or 40 years. Apparently, the President does not believe we have a spending problem in America.

Unfortunately, the facts tell us that we do. Federal spending is 22 percent higher than it was in January of '09, and debt held by the public nearly doubled by the end of the President's first term after four consecutive trillion-dollar deficits.

The seriousness of this problem was underlined yesterday when the CBO told us that unless changes are made, Federal debt held by the public will reach 76 percent of our GDP by the end of this year, the highest level since 1950, when the bills were fresh from winning World War II.

The American people recognize that perpetual large Federal deficits threaten their economic security. That's why a recent Pew Research Center poll showed 72 percent of respondents said reducing the deficit should be a top priority for national leaders. That was second only to the 86 percent who cited strengthening the economy and improving the jobs outlook. Concern about the deficit has risen from ninth among 20 issues 4 years ago to third in last month's survey.

People are worried about what perpetual Federal overspending will mean to their future. Will taxes on low- and middle-income working families have to rise to pay the bills we're racking up? Will inflation kick in, eating away at the incomes of senior citizens living on fixed incomes who already struggle to pay for gas and groceries?

Will our economy stagnate as government demand for capital crowds out private-sector borrowers who want to expand their businesses? Will our kids be condemned to a lower standard of living once our overseas creditors become concerned we won't be able to pay them back? These are real concerns.

These are the reasons we brought the PLAN Act to the floor today. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership. Life teaches that if you don't have a plan, you're planning to fail. And this President does not have any plans to balance the Federal budget ever.

The House has developed a plan to balance the budget, and we voted on it twice. This year, we intend to improve on that plan and balance the budget even sooner than the 10 years our prior proposals called for. But we can't do it alone. We need to have the cooperation of the President and the other body to make any meaningful progress.

Last month, we enacted the No Budget, No Pay law which requires both Houses of Congress to adopt a budget by April 15. Now we are hearing that the other body is planning on producing its first budget since '09, so we're making some progress.

The PLAN Act is the next step in this process. It will require the President to tell us when he thinks a balanced budget can be achieved and how he'd get us there. If his budget submission does not balance, he'll have to submit a supplemental budget by April 1 telling us the earliest date when balance can be achieved, and he will have to show us the policies he will use to make that calculation.

This way, we can begin to develop a common destination. Until we are all headed in the same direction, we'll never get there. The public is telling us we need to reduce the deficit and balance the budget. The PLAN Act will help us do that, and I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill is entitled the PLAN Act. What we really need is a plan to avoid the sequester, these across-the-board, indiscriminate cuts that are going to take place on March 1, which we all know are going to hurt jobs and the economy.

We just heard from the Republican leader. Last September, he made a very good point on the floor of this House. He said that if you allow those sequester cuts to take place, you're going to see more than 200,000 jobs lost just in the State of Virginia just in the defense sector. The across-the-board cuts are going to hurt jobs in defense, but they're also going to hurt other jobs as well as important national efforts, whether it's the FBI, whether it's border security, or whether it's medical research at the National Institutes of Health. All those things are going to be cut.

Now, the majority leader just made the point that when the American people are asked what their number one priority is, it's jobs and the economy. So why aren't we doing something about jobs and the economy? Why did the Republican leadership deny us an opportunity just to have a vote on a plan, a plan to prevent that sequester from taking place in less than a month, a plan that would replace that sequester with a mix of long-term, targeted cuts as well as revenues from, for example, getting rid of the taxpayer subsidies for the Big Oil companies?

That's the real plan we need, and yet we haven't seen any plan from our Republican colleagues in this 113th Congress. So, let's focus on what really is important to the American people. The deficit is, of course, important to the American people. As the Republican leader said, it ranked number two. There's no debate there.

The issue all along has been not whether we reduce the deficit but how we do it, making sure, number one, we don't do it in a way that hurts the economy, like some of the austerity plans in Europe, which apparently our Republican colleagues would like us to copy. That hurt the economy. We saw it didn't work in the U.K., and we believe we need to reduce the deficit in a balanced way—cuts but also revenue, by asking very wealthy people to contribute a little bit more and by closing those tax breaks that we heard about from the Republican Presidential and Vice Presidential candidate all last fall.

□ 0940

Those tax breaks are still out there. We propose to eliminate some of those for the purpose of reducing the deficit in a balanced way. That's the plan we need. That's the plan we've offered. Unfortunately, that's the plan we haven't had a chance to even get a vote on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 10¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I want to commend my friend from Maryland on the

other side for trying to change the subject. There's a lot of talk over here about the sequester. That's an important issue. There's no doubt about it. We look forward to that debate.

This is about having the President submit a budget to Congress that balances, and we're concerned about that because the last four budgets that this President has submitted to this Congress have never, ever balanced.

With that, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm grateful to Congressman TOM PRICE and his tremendous leadership on this very important issue of balancing the budget. Congressman PRICE has a vision for fiscal responsibility which creates jobs.

Spending money that we do not have is irresponsible. For the past 4 years, the Federal Government has spent over $1 trillion more each year than it receives. American families know better than spending beyond their means without consequences. The government should stop passing on depressing debt to our younger citizens.

House Republicans recognize that national security risks are at stake if we fail to get our spending under control. I hope the Senate and President will adopt actual solutions that will decrease the size of skyrocketing national debt.

The passage of Require a PLAN Act will be a significant act by requiring the President to propose a budget that balances over a 10-year period, and the American people will begin to restore their faith in Washington and believe that hope and prosperity are the future for our Nation. Balancing our budget not only protects and preserves entitlement programs for our seniors and future generations, it also provides economic certainty, which helps American small businesses create jobs.

As a grateful cosponsor of this legislation, I urge my colleagues and those across the aisle to put party politics aside and vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chair, yesterday, the President took to the White House briefing room to lecture, as he has done before, on the virtues of the so-called ''balanced approach'' to budgeting. However, while he failed to mention that his balanced approach would never lead to a balanced budget, his last 4 years have made that abundantly clear. It's long past time for the President to level with Congress and the American people about when his so-called ''balanced approach'' will actually balance the budget.

Today, the House will take up the Require a PLAN Act, which will force the President to do just that. By requiring the President to explain when and how he would balance the budget, we can begin to have an honest and constructive discussion about what it is actually going to take to prevent a debt crisis. History and math tell us that our fiscal challenges can only be solved through responsible budgeting that cuts spending and reforms entitlements.

The President's incessant demand for higher taxes is not a solution to our fiscal problems but, rather, a deceptive rhetoric that cannot withstand the scrutiny of basic math or honest budgeting. No amount of tax hikes will ever be able to steer us away from the looming debt crisis we face.

Averting the most predictable crisis in U.S. history is not a question of how, but a question of if the President will have the courage and the foresight to work with the House Republicans to lead our country out of economic stagnation and away from a future limited by mountains of debt.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I think it's important to remind our colleagues that as part of the Budget Control Act and other measures we took over the last several years, we have already cut $1.5 trillion over the 10-year budget period by placing a cap on spending. The President has been very clear, as have Democrats in the Congress. We understand we've got to make some important cuts. We did $1.5 trillion. We can do more. In fact, the substitute amendment that I proposed would eliminate these direct payments for agribusinesses, over $29 billion in unnecessary subsidies.

The question isn't whether we should do cuts. Yes, we should do them. We should do them in a smart way and not in an across-the-board way. But we should also generate revenue by closing the tax loopholes to reduce the deficit.

We heard again from our Republican colleagues throughout the last Presidential campaign about all these tax breaks that benefit very wealthy people. Let's close them to help reduce the deficit, and that's exactly what our substitute would do to help replace the sequester.

I'm now pleased to yield 2 minutes to someone who knows these issues well, a terrific new Member of Congress from the State of Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

Mr. DELANEY. In my judgment, Mr. Simpson and Mr. Bowles are American heroes because they were given a job by the President of the United States. It was a very difficult job, and the assignment required significant vision. Their job was to work in a bipartisan way with experts and come up with a proposal that was in the best interest of the common good of American citizens.

That's exactly what they did. The fact that it was rejected by our government, in my judgment, is a tragedy. If you contrast what they did to what we're considering here today with H.R. 444, it puts into context exactly the problems we have with this Congress. Because what Mr. Simpson and Mr. Bowles did is they came up with a specific proposal that had additional revenues and had important cuts to put the country on a better fiscal trajectory.

We're not here debating what proposal we should put in place to put this country on a better fiscal trajectory. That would be a worthy discussion. Nor are we talking about the things we need to do as a country to make our country more competitive, to create jobs. We're not talking about immigration reform. We're not talking about a national energy policy. We're not talking about investing in our infrastructure. What we're talking about is a gimmick that has nothing to do with the substance of the fiscal debate that we need to have in this country.

This proposal, this bill is a gimmick for career politicians in their game of chess. It has nothing to do with the substance of what the American people need us to do as a Congress. We need to adopt the framework that was put forth by the Simpson-Bowles Commission, where people actually did their job, and we need to use that as a framing document to deal with our fiscal trajectory. We then need to get on with the business of making this country more competitive so we can create jobs that have a good standard of living. To do that, we need to change important policies in this country around immigration, energy, infrastructure, and education. That's what the business of this Congress should be.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a new Member on our side of the aisle, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding as I rise in support of H.R. 444, the Require a PLAN Act.

As a small business owner, I understand the importance of a balanced budget. Ensuring that you spend within your means is vital to your employees and the success of that business. Spending beyond your means could result in layoffs, mothers and fathers not being able to put food on the table, and it ultimately could mean the demise of that company.

I get it. Families from my district in western North Carolina get it. Just last week, Eric from Asheville wrote to my office saying:

> To me it is just basic math. This is how most people that have a budget work. If you are in debt, you either need to spend less and cut back, or make more money. So I spend less, and I cut back on some of the things that are not essential. Why can't our government figure it out?

I agree with Eric from Asheville, North Carolina, and that's why I'm a proud cosponsor of Representative TOM PRICE's Require a PLAN Act, which will force President Obama to explain how he intends to balance our budget.

It's time for the Federal Government to do what hardworking, tax-paying Americans and some businessowners from across the country have to do: balance a budget and live within our means. The time is now.

□ 0950

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to another new member of our Conference, the gentleman from Texas, who knows a significant amount about budgets and who is a new member of the Budget Committee, Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 444, the Require a PLAN Act. I am a small business owner, and I have submitted a budget to my bank for 41 straight years. It is astounding that the President has shirked his responsibility to submit a budget on time for 4 of the last 5 years.

Our Nation has trillion-dollar deficits. They are threatening the economic future of this great country, yet the President and his Democratic Party leaders in the Senate have made it a habit to ignore their budgetary obligations. Under President Obama, the national debt has increased faster than under any U.S. President in history. Now is not the time to sit back and continue racking up debt that our children and our grandchildren will have to shoulder, not to mention small businesses.

The American people deserve better leadership. They have made it abundantly clear that Congress should balance the Federal budget just like families and business owners do across the country, and they do it every single day. That's why I support the House bill requiring the President to submit a balanced budget and to get Washington's spending under control, so I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

I remember that Ronald Reagan's birthday is today. May God bless our country.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to another new member of our Conference, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE).

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Madam Chair, I rise today to support H.R. 444, the Require a PLAN Act.

It is perfectly appropriate for the President to present a budget that balances within 10 years. If he does not, this bill would require him to tell us when his budget might balance. Trillion-dollar deficits for the foreseeable future are harming seniors, the poor, and middle-income families who are struggling to make ends meet. Here is how:

Our deficits are financed by Treasury bonds, most of which are being purchased by the Fed with newly created money. This drives up the price of bonds and keeps interest rates artificially low. Seniors on fixed incomes, who have saved their whole lives, now cannot make a fair interest on their savings. In addition to squeezing the incomes of our seniors, creating money to fund deficits also drives up prices, which has a disproportionate adverse effect on the seniors, on the poor, and on middle-income families.

Creating money out of thin air to fund the President's spending must stop. The first step is to stop the reckless spending by having the President present a plan to balance the budget. This is a simple request with no reasonable excuse for opposition. I support H.R. 444, the Require a PLAN Act, to protect our seniors, the poor, and middle-income families.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, we've heard a number of the last speakers complain about the fact that the President's budget will be a little late this year.

Again, for the new Members joining us—and we welcome all of the new Members, those being Republicans and Democrats—in the last session of Congress, we were here until January 2 trying to put together an agreement to avoid the fiscal cliff. That was the President's priority—to make sure that we didn't hurt jobs and the economy by going over the fiscal cliff.

The overwhelming majority of our Republican colleagues in this House voted against that plan because they were more focused on protecting tax breaks for very wealthy individuals than about protecting jobs and the economy. That's their choice. Their Senate Republican colleagues made a different choice, but our House Republican colleagues can make the choice that they want.

Now, with respect to the budget, the President will submit a budget, and our House Republican colleagues can reject it or do what they want with it. The issue is not whether he'll submit a budget. He will. The issue is whether or not we would dictate to the President what the form of his budget should take, and that is wrong.

It is also a little curious to hear this newfound support for these sort of balanced budgets from our Republican colleagues. I would just remind everybody that the last time we had a balanced budget was at the end of the Clinton administration. Why? Because, in addition to economic growth, they asked the American people to contribute a little bit more in terms of tax revenue. The Bush administration came in and immediately squandered those surpluses. I think it's important to know that, since 1950, we've had a balanced budget on only eight occasions, unfortunately. The last time we had a Republican President who balanced his budget without inheriting it from a Democratic President was Dwight Eisenhower.

So we are pleased that our Republican colleagues are joining us in trying to get back to fiscal responsibility. We see reducing the deficit as a very important part of that, but we disagree that we should do it by cutting important commitments we've made to seniors, by slashing our investment in our kids' educations, by cutting science and research and things that help power our economy and make us competitive. We think that's the wrong approach. We need a balanced approach that combines cuts with revenues from closing these tax breaks for the purpose of reducing the deficit. That's the kind of plan we need.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sometimes in these conversations and debates, Madam Chair, it's important to set the record straight. My friend from Maryland says that the reason the President hasn't been able to submit his budget on time—by the way, the law is by February 4, the first Monday in February—is due to what happened at the end of last year.

I would remind my colleague that President Obama has missed the budget deadline more than any other President. In the 90 years since the President has been required to submit a budget to Congress by the first Monday in February, President Obama is the only President to miss the deadline 2 years in a row, and he's the only President to miss the deadline 3 out of 4 years in his first term. So that's just to set the record straight.

Secondly, I would remind my friend from Maryland that the last time this country had a balanced budget it was a Republican Congress that did it. In fact, President Clinton vetoed the budget twice and then signed it, but it was a Republican Congress, and we reduced taxes at that time.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to our policy chair on the Republican side, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Back home last week, I had a gentleman who came up to me who said, ''I make $80,000 a year between my wife and me. That has always been enough until now. With the economy's slowing down and prices continuing to increase, it's not enough. What is going on?''

The simple statement that I can make to him is that the economy continues to slow down because the Federal Government continues to borrow more and more money for its own debt, taking that money out of the private sector's hands, which would typically increase the economy, increase jobs, increase economic activity; but instead, right now, it's all coming towards the Federal Government as we require more and more money, thus slowing the economy down more and more.

The unemployment rate under this President has been higher longer than any of the last 11 Presidents combined. There is something unique that I can

say to the college student coming out of college who can't find a job: This is not a typical American economy.

What's going on? We're borrowing too much money. We're slowing down the economy. It's not stimulating. It's hurting what's going on.

This simple bill just says this: as is already required by law for the House, the Senate, and the President to all put a budget out, this also says let's put a budget out because of the dire times that we are in. It says, at some point in the next 10 years, let's bring it to balance.

When the President sent his folks over last year to the Budget Committee in order to present the President's budget, I asked specifically, Does this budget balance at any point—10 years? 25 years? 75 years? Is there a point of balance? The response was, No.

We are just asking for things to balance sometime. Tell us when there is a proposed balance out there. Have a plan. Right now, we have no plan to plan, and that needs to change. The Senate hasn't had a budget for the last 4 years at all. The President presents a budget that never balances. After the fiscal cliff issues and after all of the things that have happened, our tax revenues estimated by the CBO will go up 25 percent next year. It is estimated that our revenues next year will be the highest revenues in the history of the United States, yet the President still comes back and says he needs more revenue.

We need to find areas to cut. We need a plan. We need to get into balance.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, again, just to put all this into perspective, I appreciate the sort of newfound vigor with which our Republican colleagues are approaching this issue. I would just remind them that, in the budget they brought to the floor in the last 2 years, it did not balance, according to the CBO, until 2040. Even then, if you read what the Congressional Budget Office said, it wasn't as a result of the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of their policies; it was simply based on assumptions that our Republican colleagues provided to the CBO.

□ 1000

So the real question here is: How do we reduce our deficits in a way that does not hurt the economy right now but does make sure that, as the economy improves, public spending and deficit spending does not squeeze out private investment? Actually, for the last couple of years, the problem has been the opposite. We have seen less private investment, and so the moneys the Federal Government has spent have been very important to helping the economy from going into free fall. But there's no doubt that we have to come up with a balanced approach to dealing with this issue in the outyears, and that's where the debate lies, in how we should do that.

And again, our Republican colleagues have said ''no'' to the balanced approach; they've said ''no'' to the plan that we offered to prevent the sequester; and they didn't say ''no,'' they wouldn't even allow a vote on the plan we offered to prevent the sequester that's going to hit on March 1 and which our Republican colleagues in statement after statement on this floor have said is going to hurt the economy, and which we know from the last quarter's economic report is already hurting the economy just because businesses are anticipating the possibility of these across-the-board cuts.

So that's the plan that we should be focused on. That's the plan that helps the economy, that will help save jobs. And it's just unfortunate that we've been denied an opportunity in the people's House to even have a vote on the one plan that's been submitted in this Congress, in this House, to prevent those job losses and prevent harm being done to our economy.

So I would hope, Madam Chairman, that we put aside this political gimmick. The President will submit a budget. Our Republican colleagues can do with it whatever they want, but let's put aside the political games and focus on jobs and the economy and let's have a vote on the plan that we have introduced to prevent that sequester from taking place and prevent the economic damage that it would do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, this is pretty simple stuff. It's what families do across this country. It's what businesses do across this country, and that is to make certain that they don't spend more than they take in. All this bill does is say to the President, When you bring your budget to the Congress, Mr. President, let us know when it balances. And hopefully it's not never, as he's had for the last 4 years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. I rise in opposition to this bill.

Madam Chair, it is already over one month since Congress temporarily avoided the so-called fiscal cliff, and the clock is ticking on sequestration: the across-the-board spending cuts triggered on March 1 that will devastate our economy. Yet the majority in the House is wasting time voting on an unnecessary bill (H.R. 444) which shirks their responsibilities, while pinning the blame on the President.

This legislation does nothing to address the urgent priorities of the American people—to create jobs, grow the economy, and reduce the deficit in a balanced way. It does not prevent the next self-imposed crisis, thereby threatening our recovery, risking job growth, and harming the middle class.

The majority calls this the ''Require a PLAN'' bill, but this bill is a stunt, not a solution. Now is the time to take action to avoid the harmful effects of sequestration, not for political posturing.

I urge my colleagues to reject this partisan gimmick and join me in voting against it.

Mr. POSEY. Madam Chair, a nation that does not operate on a budget is plagued by irresponsible spending with bloated budgets, unfathomable debts and jeopardizes its long-term sustainability. That's true of any family or business and it's true of governments as well.

Every state is required to have a budget and nearly all states are required to balance their budget. Sadly, the federal government has failed to operate on a budget for the past four years, and it's past time for that to come to an end.

In four out of the last five years, the President has failed to submit a budget to the Congress by the date required by law. Furthermore, each of those budgets, when eventually submitted, projected trillions of dollars in deficit spending as far as the eye could see. That is a recipe for national bankruptcy and it is morally wrong.

You would not steal from your children or grandchildren and we should not let Washington do it either.

That is why I rise in support of legislation that I have cosponsored, H.R. 444. This bill is really very simple. It requires the President to do what the U.S. House of Representatives has already done—pass a budget that balances.

I am also hopeful that the U.S. Senate will do something that it too has failed to do for the past four years—pass a budget. Any budget. That will enable the House and Senate to do what is required by law: establish a budget for the U.S. Government and live within that budget.

The House and Senate can have disagreements, but the Senate and the Administration need to go on record with their spending priorities so our system can work.

In 1997, the Balanced Budget Amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the House of Representatives, but fell one vote short of passage in the Senate. That year the national debt was $5.4 trillion. Today it is more than three times that amount—$16.5 trillion. The debt burden for each American citizen has grown from about $20,000 to over $52,000.

Back then, liberals in Washington said the same thing that they say today—that we don't need a Balanced Budget Amendment to control spending and responsibly manage the Nation's finances. There are eleven trillion reasons to prove they are dead wrong. Washington needs a spending intervention.

Earlier this week the Administration once again missed the statutory deadline for submitting a budget to Congress. It's been four years since the Senate approved a budget. All the while allowing billions of dollars in wasteful spending to slip through the cracks, further adding to our trillion dollar deficits.

We need a responsible plan to bring federal spending under control and ultimately balance the budget. Washington can no longer afford to fund itself on short-term stop-gap resolutions, last minute deals struck in the wee-hours of the morning and massive, ''too big to read'' 1,000 page omnibus spending bills.

Washington is literally charging away our children and grandchildren's futures, depriving them of the opportunities that were so readily available to current and previous generations.

Let's pass H.R. 444 and set the Nation on a more secure footing. Let's act today, before we are actually confronted with the inevitable debt crisis to come, which we have been warned about and can avoid if we get serious.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule and the bill shall be considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 444

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Require Presidential Leadership and No Deficit Act'' or the ''Require a PLAN Act''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE AND FINDINGS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to require the President to submit to Congress a supplemental unified budget if the President's budget for fiscal year 2014 does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) With this year's expected failure to meet the statutory deadline for submission of his budget, as stated by the Office of Management and Budget, the President will have only met the statutory deadline in one of his five budget submissions.

(2) Despite a promise to cut the deficit in half, the deficit doubled during the President's first year in office and has exceeded $1 trillion for four years now.

(3) Since taking office, the President has allowed the Federal debt to grow by nearly $6 trillion and total debt now exceeds the size of the entire economy of the United States.

(4) Under the President's most recent budget submission, the budget never achieves balance.

(5) The President's fiscal year 2013 budget submission includes the admission that under his own policies the Federal Government's ''fiscal position gradually deteriorates''.

SEC. 3. SUBMISSION OF A SUPPLEMENTAL UNIFIED BUDGET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the President's budget for fiscal year 2014, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, results in a projected deficit in every fiscal year for which estimates are provided in such budget, then the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget pursuant to subsection (b).

(b) CONTENTS OF SUPPLEMENTAL UNIFIED BUDGET.—Not later than April 1, 2013, the President shall submit to Congress a supplemental unified budget that includes—

(1) the information required under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code;

(2) an estimate of the earliest fiscal year in which the supplemental budget is not projected to result in a deficit;

(3) a detailed description of additional policies to be implemented in order to achieve such result; and

(4) an explanation of the differences between the President's budget for fiscal year 2014 and the supplemental unified budget referred to in this subsection.

(c) DEFINITION.—The term ''unified budget'' means the total level of outlays, total level of receipts, and the resulting deficit or surplus of the United States Government for a fiscal year.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 113–8. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–8.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amend section 2(b)(3) to read as follows:

(3) Since the President took office, Congress has allowed the Federal debt to grow by nearly $6 trillion and total debt now exceeds the size of the entire economy of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I like to call this the ''don't shift blame amendment.'' The bill before us today tries to blame President Obama for all our fiscal woes. Judging by the language of this legislation, I'm convinced the House Republicans live in a world where our entire national debt suddenly appeared on January 21, 2009. But let's be clear: Our debt was not created by the President alone. And while the President may be responsible for spending us a budget blueprint, it is ultimately Congress that holds the power of the purse. I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are forgetting a key part of our job: the President does not pass budgets, nor does he appropriate funds; Congress does.

My amendment makes a simple change to the findings section of the bill to clarify that Congress has the constitutional responsibility to fund the Federal Government.

I can guarantee that when the majority introduces its budget this month, it will be so extreme that it has no chance of passing both Houses. The Republican majority seems to be able to come together for meaningless proposals, but they know that when it comes to sensible legislation such as preventing us from going over the fiscal cliff or providing aid to Sandy victims, the 218th vote will come from a Democrat. The only thing allowing the House Republican caucus to govern is the House Democratic Caucus.

It is the majority's failure to negotiate in good faith on the budget that has gotten us here today. Year after year, the House Republican leadership has chosen to do anything within its power to discredit the President instead of working to solve our Nation's challenges.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, and although possibly well-intentioned, we're not saying at all that this is just on the President's watch, that this is simply this President that is culpable, but you'd have to ignore the President's fiscal issues that he's had over the past 4 years to think that he didn't have a hand in this.

On taking office, President Obama promised to cut the deficit in half. Madam Chair, the deficit, when the President entered office, was $458 billion. We all know that the deficit last year was $1.3 trillion—hardly in half, not even with new math.

Instead, he's presided over four straight trillion-dollar-plus deficits. Spending is 22 percent higher at the end of this President's first term than it was when he took office. Under his own budget, spending will be 40 percent higher at the end of his second term if Congress were to go along with the proposals he brings forward. And finally, the President is on track to double the national debt by the end of his term in office.

Now, my new colleague from California says that all you've got to do is pass a budget through the Congress and all things will be wonderful, and the House Republicans have passed a budget. And, Madam Chair, it's been a budget that has put us on a path to balance, yes, and we'll do that again this year. But I will remind my colleague that the Senate hasn't passed a budget in nearly 4 years, which is why 2 weeks ago this Congress, this House, passed a bill—No Budget, No Pay—where we finally got the Senate to admit that they hadn't passed a budget. And, oh, yes, by the way, they'll do one this year. We got their attention.

So, Madam Chair, though well-intentioned, trying to change the subject and the issue a little bit, this amendment doesn't—doesn't—assist in getting us to the point where it is the President's responsibility to tell the American people—in fact, it's only fair for the President to tell the American people when he brings his budget forward, when will it balance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, the House Republicans have been more focused on passing budgets that message well than introducing a budget that both the House and Senate can agree on. These are budgets that don't stand a chance of passing the Senate simply because the GOP refuses to compromise on anything. How many of their budgets end Medicare as we know it? What makes them think that the

Senate would pass a budget that goes back on the promises we made to our seniors?

The budgets passed by House Republicans are less valuable than the paper they're written on. They do not bring both sides together and are a complete waste of time and the taxpayers' money.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, what time remains for each side, please?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the vice chair of our conference, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

Today, there are still more than 12 million Americans unemployed. Parents are taking home lower wages to support their children, and families are paying more for everything from gas to groceries. For these Americans, the recession never ended.

If government spending was the key to economic growth and job creation, the economy would be booming right now. But instead, last week we found out things are getting worse. We all know the problem. For 4 years we racked up trillion-dollar deficits year after year, adding another trillion to the national debt. It's not a partisan issue. We all agree we need to fix it.

Serious problems call for serious discussions, and serious discussions require everyone to put their plan on the table. We took a solid step last week by requiring the Senate to pass a budget for the first time in 4 years, but we must continue moving forward by requiring not just a budget but a plan that actually fixes the problem.

□ 1010

We need to pass the Require a PLAN Act so the House, Senate, and even the White House are all forced to step away from campaign rhetoric and short-term gimmicks. Unlike the President's previous budget proposals, the PLAN Act will require the President to finally tell the American people when and how his budget will achieve balance.

It's time to get serious. Americans deserve better than gimmicks and campaign rhetoric; they deserve a plan.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I urge a rejection of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–8.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2(b), add the following:

(6) The President created the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform chaired by Erskine Bowles and Senator Alan Simpson, which recommended a balanced package of revenue and spending reforms to bring down projected deficits and stabilize the Federal debt as a share of the economy.

(7) These recommendations enjoy wide bipartisan support and should be considered the basis for meeting the requirements of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute.

I'm very pleased to offer the only real bipartisan amendment to this bill, and maybe one of the few bipartisan amendments we'll see this Congress. I hope not.

This is actually an attempt to rectify some of the deficiencies in the underlying bill. I certainly don't agree with the findings. As has been pointed out, the lack of a budget at this point in time is because of the fiscal cliff negotiations. Congress, frankly, is to blame for that. The President usually starts his budget in November or December, and that was impossible.

Also, I think there's a little revisionist history regarding the debt that the President did inherit. Almost one-half to two-thirds of that $1 trillion he inherited from the previous administration and previous Congresses.

Nevertheless, we do have a huge debt, and the deficit problem needs adjusting and addressing. The only bipartisan solution to that has been put forward by Simpson-Bowles. This has had widespread recognition by folks here in Congress, folks outside of Congress, businessmen and -women, as a possible solution to a long-term, unified approach to our debt and deficit. The tenets of that, of course, deal with the tax expenditures that we have and the health care costs that are going up.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I want to commend my colleague from Oregon and the colleagues that came together to submit this amendment, as I believe it truly to be well-intentioned, but I think it misses the mark. I think for two reasons, specifically, that it ought not be adopted by this body.

First, it unnecessarily restricts the ability of the President to determine how he would balance the budget. Remember, the underlying bill doesn't tie the President's hands in any way. It simply says to the President when you submit your budget to Congress, just let us know when it's going to balance. And if it's not going to balance within the period of time that's defined by the budget window, then tell us when it's going to balance, and tell us what you're going to do to make it come into balance.

And the reason that balance is important, Madam Chair, is not just because it makes numbers, zero equals zero on a page somewhere. It's because it's about the economy, to get the economy rolling again and get jobs being created. That's why it's important.

Secondly, this amendment would have the President build his balanced budget around a foundation that never balances. A lot of talk about Simpson-Bowles, and I commend them for the wonderful work that they did. However, if you get down into the details of that, there are some things in there that just simply will not work. And the biggest thing is that it never gets to balance.

So the underlying bill again, Madam Chair, is crafted very carefully so that it gives the President the greatest amount of flexibility to propose how he believes the budget ought to be balanced.

And finally, maybe the most important thing about this, the inadequacy of this amendment, is that the President has already rejected the findings in the Simpson-Bowles commission. The President's already rejected it, his own commission; said never mind, that's not the way I want to do it.

So we would suggest that allowing the President the greatest amount of flexibility on how he would propose to balance the budget—something he's never done, but we want to leave him the greatest amount of flexibility, so we ought to retain the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to my respected colleague from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. SCHRADER, for offering this amendment. I rise in support of it.

Madam Chair, we're only about 3 weeks away from the specter of sequestration, always meant to be a forcing function for us to come together to get a grand agreement. And what this amendment says is the President should use the framework, the Simpson-Bowles framework, as a starting point to get that conversation going.

You know, the President said, when he initiated that fiscal commission:

For far too long, Washington has avoided the tough choices necessary to solve our fiscal problems, and they won't be solved

overnight. But under the leadership of Erskine and Alan, I'm confident that the Commission I'm establishing today will build a bipartisan consensus to put America on the path toward fiscal reform and responsibility.

Madam Chair, last year, Cooper-LaTourette—we offered a bipartisan budget that was inspired by Simpson-Bowles, although we modified it some. What I'm asking the President to do is to come forward, to recognize this commission as a starting point, so that, once again, we can come together so we can address these unsustainable deficits.

So I'm proud to support this amendment, and ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. America is broke. America is in trouble, and the Simpson-Bowles plan is the only framework out there that truly reforms Social Security and saves it for our children and grandchildren.

When I go into high schools in my district and I ask the students, how many of you believe the Social Security system is sound, in the last 4 years, not one senior has raised their hand. The seniors know more than the Congress, both the Republican and Democratic Party, and more than the President.

Just yesterday, CBO Director Doug Elmendorf noted that the number of seniors receiving Social Security and Medicare benefits will increase by 40 percent over the next decade. In order to preserve Social Security and save it for our children, the President should use Simpson-Bowles as a starting point. He created the commission. It received bipartisan support, and then he walked away.

Some Members on both sides are afraid of this vote. You know what you ought to be afraid of? You ought to be afraid of facing your children and your grandchildren and your constituents when this country goes bankrupt and goes into decline.

I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment, and strongly urge a unanimous ''yes'' vote.

Madam Chair, I thank Mr. SCHRADER for yielding, and thank the other cosponsors of this amendment, Mr. COOPER and Mr. GIBSON, for their work.

I continue to believe that the only way to address our Nation's massive debt, which is crippling our ability to compete, is by adopting a comprehensive proposal along the lines of the Simpson-Bowles framework. It would put our Nation on a sustainable path by reducing deficits by 4 trillion dollars through a mix of spending reductions—both mandatory and discretionary—and comprehensive, pro-growth reform. By finding these savings, sequestration wouldn't even be necessary.

This amendment is simple. It adds a finding to this legislation that the president created the Simpson-Bowles Commission and suggests using Simpson-Bowles as a starting point, to meet the underlying requirements of the bill.

Quite honestly, I am disappointed that an amendment is even necessary. As Alan Greenspan noted in May, "The worst mistake the president made was not embracing that vehicle [Simpson-Bowles] right away."

I am submitting for the RECORD letters I sent earlier this week to both the president and the speaker asking both to embrace bipartisan efforts to "turn off" sequestration. Simpson-Bowles is a valid approach to deal with this problem, even though the president walked away from his own commission's hard work.

I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment and a "yes" vote on the bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I want to share the enclosed letter I sent to President Obama today urging him to immediately send a written proposal to the Congress to prevent sequestration. As has been widely reported, sequestration was originally proposed by the president's chief of staff and Treasury Secretary nominee, Jack Lew. Unfortunately, the bluntness of this policy's across-the-board cuts will lead to a hollow military force and a government unable to nimbly respond to the needs of its citizens.

Over the past two years, the House Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, has led the way in reducing discretionary spending by $98 billion, which will result in $917 billion in deficit reduction over the next decade. While these discretionary cuts have made a substantial impact, no similar reductions in spending have been made to entitlement programs or tax earmarks and other spending through the tax code. Unfortunately, the impeding sequestration would just continue the process of discretionary spending reductions, which have already been substantially reduced, while essentially leaving all other spending—the real drivers of the deficit—on autopilot. This is the area of the budget that must be reformed in order to preserve and protect them for future generations. These programs are broke. Everyone is to blame, and therefore we all need to be part of the solution. Simply put, if we do nothing, within 25 years, every Social Security recipient, regardless of age, will face an across-the-board cut of 25 percent.

That is why I have called on the president to support the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles proposal, which will ''turn off'' the need for sequestration by finding the necessary spending reductions. I therefore am offering an amendment with several of our colleagues to H.R. 444, Require a PLAN Act, which will be considered on the floor this week. This amendment simply adds a requirement that the president use this framework when submitting his budget request. It is disappointing that the president walked away from his own commission, and disappointing that he is again late in submitting his budget request to Congress. That is why, if the president continues to fail to advocate for this bipartisan solution to avert sequestration, the House must lead the way by adopting this amendment.

It is imperative that the Congress find a solution to avert sequestration before it hits at the end of this month. I ask for your support for the amendment my colleagues and I will offer today and for your broader support for the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles recommendations.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2013.

Hon. BARACK H. OBAMA,
The President, The White House, Washington DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During your October 23, 2012 debate with Governor Romney, you forcefully stated that sequestration ''will not happen.'' Despite your assurance on national television to the American people, we are now less than a month away from sequestration and I am deeply concerned that your administration is failing to exhibit any urgency in addressing this issue.

Sequestration will lead to a hollow military force and a government unable to nimbly respond to the needs of its citizens. I hope that you will not stand by and allow this to happen. The idea of ''sequestration'' was proposed by your chief of staff and nominee to be Secretary of the Treasury, Jack Lew. I write today to ask that you immediately send a written proposal to the Congress to prevent sequestration.

I am not advocating that spending reductions scheduled for our discretionary military and non-military accounts simply be waived—far from it. Our nation is nearly $16.5 trillion in debt, and, when added to our unfunded obligations and liabilities, we are facing roughly $71 trillion in future unsustainable spending commitments. Unless we change course, every penny collected by the federal government will be consumed by spending on entitlements and interest on the debt by 2025. We are spending $4.2 billion each week on interest payments to finance our debt, and this money is going to nations such as China, one of our strongest competitors which is actively spying on both our public and private sectors and has an abysmal human rights record. Our current path is simply unsustainable and is not the firm foundation our children and grandchildren expect and deserve.

I have repeatedly advocated and voted for the only bipartisan fiscal solution that has been proposed: the recommendations of the Simpson-Bowles Commission, which would have reduced the deficit by more than $4 trillion, with two-thirds of the savings coming from spending reductions, and one-third through tax reform. More importantly, it would have reduced enough spending to completely ''turn off' the need for the sequestration cuts. While you walked away from this bipartisan proposal, I was one of 38 bipartisan members of Congress to vote for it last year.

In addition to voting for bipartisan solutions like the Simpson-Bowles recommendations, I have worked to make the difficult but necessary cuts to our nation's discretionary spending. During the 112th Congress, as chairman of the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations subcommittee, I reduced spending from nearly $64 billion to nearly $52 billion for these agencies, nearly a $12 billion reduction. The House Appropriations Committee recognized the need to lead by example and started the process of reducing unnecessary spending. As subcommittee chairman, I still managed to continue investing in our nation's critical counterterrorism and research and development programs. In fact, I am proud that I was able to make these substantial cuts while funding the National Science Foundation's basic research programs and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's national security work at all-time high levels. This is the type of thoughtful and deliberate allocation of resources we

can achieve through a careful process, rather than sequestration.

But a real fiscal solution cannot be reached by focusing only on reductions to discretionary spending accounts, which account for roughly 15 percent of all federal spending. Since Fiscal Year 2010, Congress has enacted $95 billion in cuts from discretionary accounts, which has resulted in a 10-year savings of more than $917 billion.

While these discretionary cuts have made substantial progress in reducing the deficit, no similar reductions in spending have been made to entitlement programs or tax earmarks and other spending through the tax code. Unfortunately, sequestration would just continue the process of discretionary spending reductions, which have already been substantially reduced, while essentially leaving all other spending—the real drivers of the deficit—on autopilot. This is the area of the budget that must be reformed in order to preserve and protect it for future generations. These programs are broke. Everyone is to blame, and therefore we all need to be part of the solution. Simply put, if we do nothing, within 25 years, every Social Security recipient, regardless of age, will face an across-the-board cut of 25 percent.

Fortunately, there are bipartisan solutions on the table proposed by your Simpson-Bowles Commission. One of the commission's suggestions to save Social Security was to gradually raise the full Social Security retirement age by one month every two years, to slowly raise the full retirement age from 67 to 69.

What 50-year-old in McLean wouldn't be willing to work just one more month to help ensure a sound program for future generations? And I know a 40-year-old in Winchester is willing to start planning now so that they can be prepared to make the commitment to work just six more months. And, since most 30-year-olds in Clarke County believe Social Security won't even exist when they're ready for retirement—I know they'd be willing to work 11 more months to ensure that they receive benefits. That's the same reason I believe parents in Manassas will work today to prepare their four-year-olds to retire at 69, instead of 67.

I have repeatedly advocated for this bipartisan Simpson-Bowles proposal, despite my misgivings with certain sections, because I believe it is the only proposal that truly can receive the bipartisan support and embrace by the American people. Large proposals of the magnitude that are necessary to address our debt must be bipartisan in order to receive support from the American people. For example, consider the national tone that erupted after your health care reform was signed into law on a party-line-vote. Imagine how different the discourse would be if this legislation would have incorporated minority views.

It has been frustrating that you have never fully embraced your own commission's recommendations. This commission was based on legislation introduced by Senators Conrad and Gregg, that, in turn, was based off of my bipartisan SAFE Commission Act, which I first introduced in 2006 during the Bush Administration, and since partnered with Democratic Representative Jim Cooper of Tennessee.

I agree with Alan Greenspan's analysis ''one of the worst mistakes [you] ever made was not embracing the [Simpson Bowles] proposal right away.'' Your leadership would have made a difference. I still believe this proposal is the path forward. I will still advocate for many of the policies presented in this document, because it was a comprehensive approach that recognized that everyone, even the advocates of ''political sacred cows,'' must be asked to contribute to deficit reduction efforts.

Today, I am offering a bipartisan amendment to H.R. 444, Require a PLAN Act. This amendment would require you to incorporate the Simpson Bowles recommendations into your budget submission to Congress. I am disappointed that this amendment is even necessary, as I would hope you would have done this on your own initiative. It is also equally troubling that, for the fourth time in five years, you have again failed to meet your statutory deadline for filing your annual budget request.

The threat of sequestration is already having an impact on our economy, The economy unexpectedly shrank in the fourth quarter for the first time since 2009, due in large part to reductions in federal defense spending. Contractors—not just the Boeings, Booz Allens and Lockheeds of the world, but the small, women- and minority-owned subcontractors—are already feeling the pinch.

In addition, federal agencies are already being forced to prepare for this uncertainty. For example, temporary workers are not being rehired, positions sit unfilled and federal employees face the threat of 22 days of furloughs. That's one day a week for the remainder of the fiscal year where they won't get paid.

FBI agents will be pulled out of the field off of active investigations. According to a recent Washington Post article, ''New federal grants for medical research are being postponed, resulting in layoffs now and costly paperwork later. And military leaders, who are delaying training for active and reserve forces, are trying to negotiate millions of dollars in penalties that the Defense Department is incurring from canceled contracts.''

These are the same federal employees who have already been asked to contribute $103 billion to the deficit reduction efforts through your two-year pay freeze and decision to partially pay for a 10–month extension of a short-sighted payroll tax holiday by requiring new federal employees, and those with less than five years of credible experience, to spend the rest of their careers paying higher pension contributions.

Today, National Journal Daily reported that it appears that damning news articles may be the only hope to avert sequestration. This is not the way a great nation should act. I am willing to look at all options and find a solution—a solution that truly deals with entitlements and is a long term, not piecemeal, approach. Efficient contracts are not designed to be signed on two-month, six-month, or for that matter, one-year basis; they are multi-year endeavors.

Under the Constitution, there is only one person who is elected to serve all of the American people: the president. Unlike the Congress, which is elected just by one district or state, your office, as the chief executive, must strive to represent all Americans, including the parts of the country that will be devastated by the thoughtless cuts enacted through sequestration.

Yet over the last month, you have used your ''bully pulpit'' not to bring the American people and Congressional leadership together on a sequestration solution, but instead to start ''national conversations'' about guns and immigration. While there may be merit to addressing these issues, the looming sequestration deadline should make resolving this crisis the most important item on your agenda. But both your recent actions and your words do not represent the seriousness of the task at hand.

Mr. President, House Republicans are just a majority of the minority—we control one half of one of three branches of the government. Your leadership is needed. I have always strived to represent my constituents in an honest and open manner. Let's dispense with the straw man arguments. We all bear responsibility for the situation before us, and thus must consider all options, even those that are not ideal. I know you appreciate the severity of the situation. I'm prepared to give full consideration should you propose a serious bipartisan solution.

I suggest you start with the recommendations of your own Simpson-Bowles Commission, which you have thus far failed to support. Its time has come and I hope you will embrace its bipartisan solutions and call on Congress to adopt it.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN.)

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. SCHRADER, and his colleagues for offering this amendment.

I support the overall framework of Simpson-Bowles. I've said that many times. If you look at the balance in Simpson-Bowles between the cuts and the revenue, it's something, I think, that is the model that we should be using in this body. And I do want to submit for the RECORD an analysis that was done by the Center For Budget Policy Priorities that shows exactly what that breakdown would be.

I don't support every single recommendation within Simpson-Bowles, but I think we have an obligation, if we don't like one of their cuts, to come up with an alternative cut. If we don't like their revenue, we should come up with alternative revenue.

But what the Simpson-Bowles proposal does is it creates a framework saying that we need to take a balanced approach to reducing our deficit.

I was listening to my friend, Mr. PRICE, explaining his opposition to this. He didn't want to impose requirements on the President; simply ask the President to consider these proposals. And as the President himself has said, he has incorporated many of the proposals from Simpson-Bowles into his own budget, the ones he submitted last year and the one that he will submit this year. So I support the framework, not every recommendation, but the overall framework.

SUMMARY OF UPDATED BOWLES-SIMPSON ESTIMATES

To assess Bowles-Simpson today so that policymakers can compare it with other plans, one must look at the Bowles-Simpson savings over 2013–2022, relative to a current policy baseline. One must also account for the $1.5 trillion in discretionary spending cuts that policymakers have since enacted. When that is done, the results show that:

TABLE 1—SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL BOWLES-SIMPSON PLAN

	Total plan	Not yet enacted
Ten-year cumulative totals in trillions of dollars		
Revenue increases–	2.6–	2.6
Program cuts–	2.9–	1.4

TABLE 1—SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL BOWLES-SIMPSON PLAN—Continued

	Total plan	Not yet enacted
Interest savings–	0.8–	0.6
Total deficit reduction–	6.3–	4.6
Ratio, program cuts to revenue increases		
Not counting interest–	1.1 to 1.0–	0.5 to 1.0
Counting interest–	1.4 to 1.0–	0.8 to 1.0

Note: Covers 2013 through 2022; excludes Social Security solvency proposals; measured relative to current policy; may not add due to rounding.

Over 2013–2022, Bowles-Simpson called for $6.3 trillion in deficit reduction—$5.5 trillion in policy savings and about $800 billion in interest savings. (That figure excludes Bowles-Simpson's Social Security solvency proposals, consistent with their presentation of the plan's deficit reduction totals; see the box on page 2.)

The $5.5 trillion in policy savings in the Bowles-Simpson plan consists of almost $2.9 trillion in program cuts and almost $2.6 trillion in revenue increases—that is, 53 percent from budget cuts and 47 percent from revenue increases, or almost a 1–to–1 ratio of program cuts to revenue increases.

This nearly 1–to–1 ratio does not include the interest savings. If one counted interest savings as a spending reduction, the ratio is 59 percent in spending cuts to 41 percent in revenue increases, or a 1.4–to–1 ratio of program cuts to revenue increases.

Bowles-Simpson was typically described as having a 2–to–1 ratio, but that is because the co-chairs assumed the expiration of the upper-income tax cuts as part of their baseline and thus did not count the revenue savings in their ratio. They also estimated higher interest savings (which counted under their plan as a spending reduction) than our analysis does because the interest rates projected at that time were higher than interest rates now are projected to be.

Of the nearly $2.9 trillion of program cuts in the Bowles-Simpson plan, about half—or just under $1.5 trillion—have already been enacted. If one excludes the enacted savings:

TABLE 2—DEFICIT REDUCTION UNDER THE ORIGINAL BOWLES-SIMPSON PLAN

[EXTENDED TO COVER 2013-2022; DOLLARS IN BILLIONS]

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	10-yr total
Revenue increases:											
Tax reform	20	40	80	90	105	120	150	180	215	250	1,250
Revenue increases built into baseline	49	62	89	99	110	121	130	138	148	157	1,103
Increase gas tax 15 cents	2	7	11	16	18	18	18	18	18	18	144
Chained CPI [a]: revenue effect	2	3	5	7	8	10	11	12	14	16	88
Subtotal	73	112	185	212	241	269	309	348	395	441	2,585
Mandatory health programs	19	31	33	37	43	49	58	65	70	75	480
Other mandatory programs/fees:											
Chained CPI [a]	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	55
Other mandatory programs/fees	10	13	18	22	25	29	32	36	38	40	263
Subtotal	11	15	21	26	30	35	39	44	47	50	318
Appropriated (discretionary) programs:											
Security	61	86	101	117	133	148	163	178	193	208	1,386
Non-Security	27	36	48	57	65	73	81	90	98	107	682
Subtotal	88	122	148	174	197	221	244	267	291	316	2,068
Total deficit reduction policies:											
Revenue increases	73	112	185	212	241	269	309	348	395	441	2,585
Program reductions	118	168	203	237	270	305	341	376	408	441	2,866
TOTAL	191	280	388	448	511	574	650	725	803	882	5,450
Resulting reductions in interest costs	1	3	6	17	38	72	107	144	187	234	807
Total: policies and interest savings	191	283	394	466	549	645	756	869	989	1,116	6,257
Addendum: Social Security solvency:											
Increase the "taxable maximum"	5	8	12	15	19	22	26	30	35	40	212
Chained CPI [a]	3	5	8	10	12	15	17	19	22	25	136
Benefit improvements	0	0	0	0	0	−5	−6	−5	−4	−3	−34
Subtotal	8	13	20	25	31	32	37	44	53	62	325
Resulting reductions in interest costs	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	8	11	14	45

May not add due to rounding. Sources: Moment of Truth Project, Updated Estimates of the Fiscal Commissions Proposal, June 29, 2011; author's extension for 2022; adjustments for current policy revenue baseline and CBO's 2010 discretionary baseline based on data from CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation.

[a] The "chained CPI" refers to a proposal to alter the way the Consumer Price Index is measured; a number of analysts believe the proposal would measure inflation more accurately, slightly reducing the measure. Because the tax code, Social Security, and some other federal programs such as Supplemental Security Income are indexed to the CPI, the proposal would cut spending and raise revenues.

The Bowles-Simpson plan would achieve an additional $4.6 trillion in deficit reduction over ten years. (This doesn't include the small savings in the first ten years from the plan's Social Security proposals.)

The majority of the remaining savings in the plan is on the revenue side: for every $0.54 of additional spending cuts, there would be $1.00 in new revenue under the Bowles-Simpson plan (or 35 percent budget cuts and 65 percent revenue increases), excluding interest savings.

If one counts interest savings as a spending reduction, then the ratio of the remaining savings would be 43 percent program reductions and 57 percent revenue increases, or $0.76 of spending cuts for each $1.00 of revenue raisers.

The figures in this summary are shown in Table 1.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, again, I think the intention of the amendment is sound. However, it's important to appreciate that the Simpson-Bowles approach fails to address the primary driver of spending, and that's health care. And maybe that was why the President rejected it. I don't know.

□ 1020

But the fact of the matter is that the Simpson-Bowles approach leaves in place the President's health care law with its $1.7 trillion in higher spending, soon to be over $2 trillion, and its trillion-plus dollars higher taxes. So I think this amendment, again, ties the President unnecessarily and that it's a step in the wrong direction. I would urge its defeat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the discussion here. I hope that America would know this is a bipartisan amendment. America should be pleased that some Republicans and some Democrats are coming together to solve our country's problems.

The good chairman from Georgia is unfortunately misinformed regarding Simpson-Bowles. It did include, of course, a great deal of discussion on health care and health care costs. The ACA, contrary to some misconceptions, actually saved over $700 billion in taxpayer money over the long haul.

I think at this point in time, the President, whose own debt commission was Simpson-Bowles, would be pleased to have a little direction from the ultimate appropriating budget body, which is Congress, not the President. Give him some direction; enable his commission to guide us with that bipartisan balanced approach, including revenues, including through tax reform, making sure that our health care and safety net is there for our kids and grandkids, as the gentleman from Virginia talked about.

This is a very important point in this Congress' deliberations. We have to come together. I urge an ''aye'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I commend the gentleman once again, but I would point out that there's nothing in the underlying bill that precludes the President from using this as a model if that is what he so desires. But there isn't any reason why we ought to constrain the President to hopefully bring to this Congress a budget that, for the first time in this administration, actually gets to balance. That's what the underlying bill is all about. Mr. President, bring us a budget. Just tell us when it balances, because, oh, by the way, the last four budgets that you submitted have never gotten to balance.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–8.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Section 3(b)(3) is amended by inserting after ''result'' the following: ''(including an evaluation of duplicative agency functions and agency effectiveness, and proposals for consolidating duplicative functions and programs between agencies in the interests of cost-savings)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 444, the PLAN Act, introduced by my colleague, Dr. TOM PRICE.

Dr. PRICE's bill is straightforward: if the President's budget doesn't balance, tell us when it will and what policies he will use to get us there.

My amendment adds a requirement that the President's supplemental budget, as required by the PLAN Act, must include proposals to consolidate duplicative agency functions and programs.

Here's the good news: Reducing duplication in government is low-hanging fruit. There's bipartisan agreement on this. Even the President in his State of the Union address in 2011 talked about the desire to consolidate the different agencies that oversee salmon.

Now, it's true that the President does submit a document as part of the budget, called, Cuts, Consolidations, and Savings; but in last year's budget, these savings only amounted to $24 billion, a tiny percentage, 2.2 percent, of our annual trillion-dollar shortfall. That is woefully inadequate.

My amendment would require the President to go back to the drawing board within the context of the PLAN Act, which asks the President to tell us when his budget will balance and how he will get us there.

We are now in receipt of two reports from the GAO that identify opportunities to reduce duplication and overlap in government programs, and we anticipate the third annual report to be released in just a few weeks. The first report identified 81 areas of duplication, and the executive branch and Congress responded with only limited action on many of those areas. The second report identified an additional 51 areas.

In addition, Senator TOM COBURN has produced a helpful report that points out some very obvious ways we could consolidate government programs and reduce government spending.

Suggestions from both of these sources should be added to the President's proposals for cuts. Surely, we can come to some bipartisan agreement about cutting government programs that are duplicative, obsolete, or wasteful aspects.

Sometimes the cause of this is special interests: businesses or industry groups that are arguing for a particular program that benefits them, or a geographic area that benefits from a program that others can't take advantage of, or a group that is adept at leveraging identity politics to protect special preferences. Other times, Congress is its own worst enemy, bickering over jurisdiction and bringing goodies back home.

Regardless of where the problem is, we need to fix it. This is a start in the process, but unfortunately we can't actually force consolidations in this bill. I will be introducing legislation in the coming weeks to do just that: force the elimination or consolidation of duplicative agencies through a BRAC-like process that is fair and bipartisan.

The Realign and Eliminate Duplicative Unnecessary Costly Excess in Government Act, otherwise known as the REDUCE Government Act for short, creates a six-member, evenly split bipartisan commission selected by the congressional leadership and the President. The commission will use resources from GAO and standard program evaluation tools to come up with a list of duplicative, ineffective, and wasteful programs and a plan to consolidate or eliminate those programs. After submitting a list to the President, Congress will have 45 days to pass a resolution of disapproval. After that, the consolidation goes into effect.

This process mirrors the highly successful, nonpolitical Base Realignment and Closure process, otherwise known as BRAC, used to take politics out of the highly sensitive and politically charged military basing process. With clear, transparent criteria, a nonpartisan agenda, and a streamlined process for action, the BRAC Commission has been able to do what Congress or the President has never been able to do before. Clearly, with our spending problem, we need a mechanism like this to set in motion the reduction in the growth of government.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and allow it to be debated in the full House. While I would hope the President would do this, we can't leave it to chance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition, even though I will not ultimately oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I support this amendment because this is something we all want to see happen and which the President himself has indicated he wants to see happen. In the last fiscal year budget, in fact, the President, through OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, submitted something called Cuts, Consolidations, and Savings to be considered by the Congress and the executive branch; and he also asked that legislation be submitted on his behalf to help give him more authority to reorganize some of these government agencies, which was introduced during the last Congress by Mr. BARROW, who may well intend to reintroduce that.

Madam Chairman, these are things I think we all would like to see, greater efficiencies that help save money in a smart way. The President has indicated not only his intention but specific proposals to do so, and so we do not object. In fact, I support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. FLEMING. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for agreeing with what is really common sense. We all, I think, want to squeeze out waste in government and certainly take away the duplication that's behind much of it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–8.

Mr. MESSER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 3(b), strike ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3), strike the period at the end of paragraph (4) and insert ''; and'', and add at the end the following:

(5) an estimate of the cost per taxpayer of the annual deficit for each year in which the supplemental unified budget is projected to result in a deficit.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Require a PLAN Act because the American people deserve to know when or whether the budget proposed by the President would achieve balance and what policies are being pursued to require the Federal Government to live within its means.

My amendment today is based on a very simple principle—that each hardworking American taxpayer deserves to know how much the deficit costs

them every year. To achieve this goal, the amendment very simply will require the supplemental unified budget called for in the underlying bill to include the cost per taxpayer of the annual deficit for each year that budget is projected in deficit. This requirement would be a powerful reminder to the President and Congress that our decisions have real world consequences for hardworking taxpayers.

We've all heard the question asked, how much is a trillion dollars? It's very difficult to quantify. It's very difficult to bring it into a real world context. What this bill will do is allow us to do that for taxpayers.

Our constituents might be surprised by what they learn. According to the Internal Revenue Service, there were about 145 million tax-paying Americans last year. With a trillion-dollar budget deficit that we've had in recent years, that would calculate out to about $6,896 per year per taxpayer to cover our existing deficit. The total tab for the past 4 years of $1 trillion each year would be about $27,500 a year. Back in the Sixth District of Indiana where I come from, that is a lot of money. I think we owe it to the taxpayers to let them know what we're doing here in Washington.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I think it is very useful to let everybody in the country know exactly what the debt and deficit will be on a per capita basis. We in Congress of course can do the math. I think it's no problem asking the President to run that calculation as well.

Again, I want to emphasize the fact that there's agreement on reducing the deficit; the real differences here are over how we do it. But regardless of how you want to do it, I think the gentleman has offered a useful amendment. The more information for the American people, the better, and we will not object and in fact support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. I yield 1 minute to my good friend and classmate, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment because in the 60 seconds that I speak before this body, the Federal Government will spend $7 million. Madam Chair, in the 60 seconds I speak before this body, the Federal Government will borrow $3 million.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment because in Washington political will has replaced principled leadership, and our economy is paying the price.

These discussions over spending cuts and fiscal priorities can be difficult. Telling the President that he has failed to lead can make my friends on the other side of the aisle uncomfortable, but we cannot let the emotion of the moment override the honesty of the moment.

Sustainable debt is a myth. The number of people in Federal programs has grown faster than the U.S. population, and continuing to grow our Federal debt is like driving with the emergency brake on—it will not get us where we want to go and do significant damage in the process.

The more government borrows, the more interest it pays. Last year, the U.S. spent $220 billion in net interest on its debt, and this number will only continue to grow unless serious reforms are made.

This is a commonsense amendment that our constituents deserve to see passed. This amendment forces Washington to confront the very same reality that American taxpayers face every day: you cannot spend more than you earn. I support this amendment and the underlying bill, and thank the gentleman from Indiana and my colleague from Georgia for their leadership.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his statement in support of the bill. It's a commonsense provision, and I appreciate your support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–8.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Section 3(b) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting ''; and'' at the end of paragraph (4), and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

(5) under a separate heading entitled ''Direct Spending'', which shall include a category for ''Means-Tested Direct Spending'' and a category for ''Nonmeans-Tested Direct Spending'' and sets forth—

(A) the average rate of growth for each category in the total amount of outlays during the 10-year period preceding the budget year;

(B) information on the budget proposals for reform of such programs;

(C) a description of programs which shall be considered means-tested direct spending and nonmeans-tested direct spending for purposes of this paragraph; and

(D) an annual estimate of the total amount of outlays for each such program for the period covered by the budget proposal.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, the amendment that I bring forward just puts some additional transparency into a piece of legislation that I strongly support that just requires the President to lay out a detailed plan of how his budget would balance.

What this amendment would do would be to specifically carve out direct spending. Direct spending, Madam Chair, represents more than 60 percent of all Federal expenditures. So more than 60 percent of our budget is direct spending, both means tested and nonmeans tested. All we ask for with this amendment is the transparency that as that supplemental budget is produced, that it also breaks out how means-tested spending and non-means-tested spending, number one, was averaged over the prior 10 years, but also, in this supplemental budget the President would lay out, what would happen to those direct spending programs over the course of the period that the President would lay out in that supplemental budget.

One other thing it does is it makes sure that if there are any reforms, just like in the House budget, if we lay out any reforms, those would have to be spelled out in the language of this amendment. So if any reforms to direct spending would be included in the President's supplemental budget, that those reforms would have to be spelled out in an actual text of that document.

This is something we already included in the House rules package. It's part of the House rules when a House budget is presented, so we felt like the American people deserve this kind of transparency, especially when you're talking about more than 60 percent of the budget. Let's just make sure it's laid out.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Again, what this amendment does is ask the President, when he submits the budget, to provide certain information about mandatory spending and means-tested spending. In fact, the President already does this in his budget. I have in my hand, in fact, the budget for fiscal year 2013—that's the current fiscal year that we're in now—historical tables that were submitted by the President as part of that budget submission. The categories include mandatory spending, and within mandatory spending they break it down: Social Security deposit insurance, means-tested entitlements, and others. So this is information that the President already provides as part of the budget process. I'm happy to support him continuing to do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, at this time I'd like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the author of the underlying bill.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I want to commend my colleague from Louisiana and the chair of the Republican Study Committee for bringing forth this amendment and supporting the underlying bill.

The amendment, as the gentleman from Maryland said, simply provides greater information, more transparency, more information from the President in his budget on the differences between the mandatory and the means-tested in the discretionary side of the budget.

It also, I think, is so important for the American people to gain as much information as possible as we move through this national debate, the national debate of whether or not it is appropriate for the President to bring a budget to Congress that in the past 4 years has never balanced.

The underlying bill, again, urges the President to bring a budget to the Congress that gets to balance and let's the American people know when it does. So I want to commend my colleague from Louisiana for his amendment and urge adoption of the amendment and the underlying bill.

□ 1040

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, if I may inquire, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCALISE. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL).

Mr. RADEL. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his hard work.

I would like to take a moment to speak, in fact, in support of the Scalise amendment. In doing so, there's a much bigger picture here, a bigger picture that, quite frankly, isn't even being talked about when it comes to the challenges our country faces today. Our problems go beyond Republican and beyond Democrat. Our problems are numbers, debt and deficits that we cannot even begin to wrap our arms around.

So what we must do as a country and beyond party lines is work together as Americans. Today I ask for your support of this amendment to demand accountability and transparency from Washington, accountability when it comes to your money—not tax dollars, not stimulus dollars—your money.

We often hear from the President that we cannot cut, cut, cut, and I agree. This is not about cutting. This is about saving. This is about saving Social Security, saving Medicare, saving our economy and ultimately our government. In the big picture, we must demand that we, as elected officials and servants of the people, are held accountable. Both the Scalise amendment and the Require a PLAN Act do just that.

Mr. SCALISE. At this time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the Republican whip from Kendall, California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the amendment. This amendment will help bring transparency and accountability back to the budget process, something that has been sorely lacking under this President.

Let's just look at the facts:

The last budgets from this President that were voted on have not received one vote in support from the House or the Senate—that's on the Democrat side nor the Republican side;

Every year this President has been in office, he's had deficits of $1 trillion, adding $6 trillion to the debt;

Out of the last five budgets, four of them have been late;

The President has never submitted a budget to this House or the other that balances.

That is a record of failure that is distressing to this House and to the American people. We deserve better.

It's unfortunate that this House has to pass bills to get responsible budgeting. That's why I support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, I'm prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I will not use all the time. As I said, what this amendment requests is information that, in fact, the President already provides as part of the budget submission. I indicated I have in my hand that information from the last fiscal year's budget. I do think that in pursuit of transparency it's important to point out that when the President was first sworn in his first term, before he put his hand on the Bible, he faced a projected deficit of well over $1 trillion—a record deficit at that time.

As we saw from the Congressional Budget Office in their report just the other day, that deficit is now coming down. As the economy has improved and as the President's policies have begun to take shape, that deficit is on its way down. Is it far enough down? No. And there's a legitimate debate as to the best way to get there, but as part of that debate, certainly the more information, the better. And as I indicated, this information that is being requested is, in fact, already provided to the Congress. So we will not oppose it. In fact, I would support the amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I rise in support of this amendment.

As our ranking member has said, this information is already provided. But I also rise in support of the Simpson-Bowles proposal. I voted for it on the floor of the House, one of only three dozen who support it, but hopefully many more will support it.

We need to get our fiscal house in order. The majority party has this kind of selective amnesia, however, about this. When the President was sworn in, we were $11 trillion in debt at that moment. We had a $1 trillion deficit for that fiscal year the day he was sworn in. Your party seems to run away from any responsibility for this.

And then you passed a budget the last couple years that doesn't balance until 40 years from now, and now this rush to the floor that we must have balance, we must have transparency. But that's okay. Whatever brings you to the party. It's like in my church. If you come and you find a belief, a shared belief that a fellowship of faith has, that's great.

So if you're joining this party that we want to get our fiscal house in order and that deficits do matter and that the debt matters, then we welcome that. If this is a political charade, then you should be concerned about your credibility.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, clearly, if you look at what happened, we don't have the numbers from the President because he missed his statutory deadline, so we're hoping that he at least puts forth a budget. It would be ideal if he puts forth a budget that shows balance in some period of time, as we've done; but at the same time, we also expect transparency so that the American taxpayers can see where more than 60 percent of the budget is spent.

So I urge adoption of this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.

REQUIRE PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND NO DEFICIT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 48 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4444.

Will the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) kindly take the chair.

□ 1058

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATHAM (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6, rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–8 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SCHRADER of Oregon.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 228, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

AYES—194

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Woodall
Yarmuth

NOES—228

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Cantor
Crawford
Farr
Gabbard
McNerney
Reed
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Wilson (FL)

□ 1122

Mr. PERRY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Messrs. TERRY, FORTENBERRY, WALBERG, ROONEY, and MICA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, PETERS of Michigan, GARAMENDI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Messrs. CLYBURN and YARMUTH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chair, on roll-call No. 35, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCHRADER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 75, noes 348, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

AYES—75

Barrow (GA)
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Carney
Cassidy
Coble
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Dent
Fattah
Foster
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hoyer
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Larsen (WA)
Lipinski
Lummis
Matheson
McIntyre
Meehan
Meeks
Michaud
Moran
Owens
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rigell
Rooney
Ross
Ruppersberger
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (WA)
Speier
Thompson (CA)
Van Hollen
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Welch
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—348

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Crawford
DelBene
Farr
Gabbard
McNerney
Reed
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner

□ 1127

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 36 I was detained in a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATHAM, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 444) to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 48, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Schwartz moves to recommit the bill H.R. 444 to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike section 2(b) and insert the following:

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Since 2009, every bipartisan commission, including the one appointed by the President, has recommended—and the majority of Americans agree—that we should take a balanced, bipartisan approach to reducing the deficit that addresses both revenue and spending.

(2) Sequestration—established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 that was passed by the Congress and signed by the President—is a meat-ax approach to deficit reduction that imposes deep and mindless cuts, regardless of their impact on vital services and investments.

(3) Congress should immediately pass legislation that the President could sign that replaces the sequester with a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting Social Security and a strong social safety net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I rise in opposition to this bill and to offer the final amendment that will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill, as amended, will immediately proceed to final passage.

This amendment rejects the rigid partisan view presented in this legislation that deficit reduction must be achieved by spending cuts alone, regardless of the consequences. Moving from one crisis to another and failing to meet our responsibilities, as Republicans have done time and time again, has hurt our economic growth. Most recently, in December, our economy contracted for the first time in 3 years as a result of delayed action by Republican leadership in the House.

This amendment makes clear that there's a better way. It recognizes that our Nation faces serious fiscal challenges. We agree, as the President does, that these fiscal challenges must be addressed. We believe that we must reduce the deficit over time and we must work to stabilize the debt. But we must do so in a way that does not hurt our economic recovery, that enables us to meet our obligations to our seniors and to our children and to our future, and ensures our economic competitiveness and economic growth.

Every bipartisan commission has said that the only way we can meet these goals—to reduce the deficit, to meet our obligations, and to make investments necessary for economic growth—is to do so in a balanced way with a combination of spending cuts and new revenues. And the American people agree. American consumers and American businesses agree. Economists and investors, workers and managers, older Americans and young adults all agree. We need a balanced approach. We need to find that common ground and we need to make decisions now that provide certainty and stability for our families, for our businesses, and for our Nation. Yet the Republicans reject this balanced approach. They prefer to place blame and to seek to deflect attention from the realities before us.

The automatic across-the-board cuts of $85 billion will go into effect in just 22 days. Rather than work with us and to work with the President to find a better way to avoid the sequester with a mix of cuts and revenue, they suggest a new budget process that may not be constitutional and surely will not be productive.

The bill before us is simply a political message. We should reject that narrow message. Instead, we should make clear that we are willing to find that balanced approach that enables us to put our great Nation on sound financial footing by providing certainty during economic recovery, reducing the deficit over time, sustaining Medicare for seniors now and into the future, protecting Social Security, and by creating opportunity for middle class Americans and investing in education, research, science, innovation, and infrastructure to ensure our economic competitiveness. Because if we do, we will not only reduce the deficit, we will expand opportunity and prosperity for all Americans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1140

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Pennsylvania states that all we look at are spending cuts alone, that that's the way we believe the budget ought to be balanced. Certainly not. In fact, we believe strongly that pro-growth policies will actually assist in getting us to balance much, much sooner.

The CBO yesterday, in fact, said that currently the revenues within a 10-year period of time are going to double; in fact, the revenues this year, this fiscal year, will reach the 10-year average, and the revenues in the next fiscal year will be the highest level of revenues ever recorded in the history of this Nation. Mr. Speaker, we have a spending debt crisis, not a revenue debt crisis.

My colleague says that we reject a balanced approach. On the contrary. In fact, all you've got to do is read our budget. There's a balanced approach. It brings about appropriate spending reductions, appropriate closure of loopholes in credits and reductions of the Tax Code to gain revenue in pro-growth policy so that we can balance the budget.

My friends on the other side of the aisle talk about needing to vote on the sequester right way, to change the sequester right away. In fact, that's exactly what House Republicans have done two times, Mr. Speaker, in the last year, once in May, once in December. In fact, the recent bill we adopted reprioritized the spending reductions included in the sequester so that there was a calculated way to reduce spending that did not have across-the-board spending reductions. Our friends on the other side oppose that.

Mr. Speaker, the President's sequester, the item that he put in place, we have proposed positive solutions for on two occasions and passed through this House. The Senate has refused to act on those.

The President yesterday proposed a plan in a speech, not specific legislation, that, in fact, we've talked about through our proposals that we passed through this House on two occasions, in May and December of last year.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill is pretty doggone simple. It only asks the President to do what families do and businesses do all across this Nation every single year, and that is to make certain that we don't spend more money than we take in.

House Republicans on two occasions over the past 2 years have passed a budget that gets us on a path to balance. We will do it again. Two weeks ago we passed a bill out of this House to make certain that we held the Senate to account, to require them to do a budget, something they haven't done in the last 4 years.

The bill before us today simply says to the President, Mr. President, when you bring your budget to Congress, just let us know when it comes to balance, that's all. And, oh, by the way, the past four budgets that the President has proposed have not ever come to balance.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the House and the Senate and the President work together to get a balanced budget to spend responsibly so we can reinvigorate this economy and create jobs.

Turn down this motion to recommit. I urge my colleagues to accept the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 229, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

AYES—194

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Crawford
Engel
Farr
Gabbard
McNerney
Reed
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1152

Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. HORSFORD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 167, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

AYES—253

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—167

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Crawford
Farr
Gabbard
McCarthy (NY)
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Negrete McLeod
Reed
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner

□ 1158

Mr. POLIS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning, right here in our Nation's Capital, your country's leaders will meet to gather in prayer. Yes, I said ''in prayer.'' For 60 years now, Presidents, Members of Congress, and other leaders have gathered every year for the National Prayer Breakfast.

So today I want to take a moment to stand here and say it is time to acknowledge the importance of faith in God within our Nation and the importance of prayer in our lives. Our Founding Fathers were men of faith, believing that America should be a shining city on a hill for the world to see.

So as we participate in this year's National Prayer Breakfast, I call on our leaders and all Americans to pray for our country. Pray for our men and women in uniform and their families as they sacrifice to help protect our Nation and ensure our freedoms. Pray for our President and our elected officials, that they may remember the people they are elected to serve. Pray not just tomorrow, but every day.

As we gather tomorrow morning for the prayer breakfast, let us pour out our hearts to God, lift one another up, and commit to working toward a better America.

My prayer will be simple. I pray that God will continue to bless the United States of America.

EXCESSIVE PAY AT BAILED-OUT COMPANIES

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a report by the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, or SIGTARP, about compensation at bailed-out companies, bailed-out Wall Street companies, their excessive compensation.

The report shows that the U.S. Treasury Department approved wildly inappropriate pay packages of $3 million or more for over half of the top 25 employees at certain bailed-out Wall Street banks.

Executive compensation at AIG is particularly disturbing, given that the Federal Government financed a $182.3 billion bailout of that company. In 2012, AIG's top CEO was paid $10.5 million, and all but one of AIG's top 25 employees received compensation of more than $2 million. That one AIG executive who was paid less than $2 million received $700,000 in total compensation, which is well over 1,000 times more than the average American household earns in a year.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it time for Wall Street and the Treasury Department to wake up and stop abusing the assistance they received from the taxpayer, and isn't it time for the Department of Justice to prosecute?

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, Mr. CANTOR, for the purposes of telling us the schedule for next week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. The House will recess no later than 5:30 p.m. to allow for a security sweep of the House Chamber prior to the President's State of the Union address. The House will meet again at approximately 8:35 p.m. in a joint session with the Senate for the purpose of receiving an address from the President of the United States. Members are advised that no votes are expected on Tuesday evening in order to accommodate the State of the Union address.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10:00 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we will consider several bills under suspension of the rules on Tuesday and Wednesday, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business on Friday.

Additionally, I expect the House to consider H.R. 273, legislation that prevents Members of Congress, the President's Cabinet, the Vice President, and other nonmilitary Federal employees from receiving an automatic pay raise under the President's recent executive order. This legislation introduced by freshman Representative RON DESANTIS of Florida would extend the current Federal pay freeze that has been in place since 2011.

Hardworking taxpayers and families live within a budget, and it's time that we in Washington do the same.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I might ask a preliminary question. When the gentleman refers to the bill that is to be considered next week, I presume he is referring to the cost of living adjustment increase?

With that, I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I'd respond to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that it is the pay increase that is within the President's executive order.

Mr. HOYER. Which deals with a cost of living increase. Am I correct?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would just say it is a pay increase within the President's executive order.

□ 1210

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I disagree with his conclusion because, clearly, what we're dealing with is a cost-of-living increase similar to that which is given to Social Security recipients and others to make sure that the pay is not degraded that average working people in this country, in this Federal Government, receive, including a large number of people in Virginia and in my State, but that's only 15 percent of the Federal workforce which is around the country. I think it's unfortunate that now, for 2½ years, the only working people in America who have received a freeze or a decrease or who have contributed to solving the debt crisis which confronts us, on which the gentleman and I agree, are Federal workers. I'm not talking about Members of Congress, and I'm not talking about the President or the Vice President. The President doesn't get a COLA adjustment, obviously, but it's a cost-of-living adjustment.

I will say to my friend—and I have worked over the last 20 years with his counterparts, either in the majority or in the minority, to ensure that we made the distinction so that people understood and didn't demagogue that issue—that I regret that we are doing so here again. While it may well be appropriate to, from time to time, freeze even the cost-of-living adjustment, it is also appropriate to refer to it for what it is and not as a pay raise. In fact, the courts have indicated, as the gentleman knows, that it is a cost-of-living adjustment, but we don't need to debate that further unless the gentleman wants to say something.

Mr. CANTOR. I would just say, as to the statement that, perhaps, Federal employees are the only ones who have had to shoulder the burden, I don't necessarily agree with that, because there are millions of people in the private sector who not only have gone without a pay increase, but many of whom don't have jobs anymore. You also have the instance, Mr. Speaker, that many millions of Americans have just received a significant tax increase due to what happened here on the fiscal cliff bill.

There are a lot of implications and consequences for the downturn in the economy. I dare say that there are a lot of people who are struggling out there in the private sector, so I'd just state a little bit of difference from the gentleman in saying that no one else is sacrificing right now, because there are a lot of people who have no pay increase and a lot of people who have no jobs.

Mr. HOYER. In reclaiming my time, the gentleman, respectfully, misstates what I said. There are a lot of people sacrificing and a lot of people who don't have jobs. I want to talk a little bit about that as we deal—or don't deal—with the sequester.

What I said was that the only people we had, as a policy, reduced—and the gentleman is correct. We did raise taxes on those over $400,000. There is nobody in the Federal service, of course, who makes over $400,000. The

President makes $400,000. He is at the top, as he should be, and he doesn't get a COLA adjustment, but there is nobody in the Federal service who makes over $400,000. They are the only people we've raised contributions on. Others have, in fact, indeed, sacrificed because they've lost their jobs; they've had their pay frozen because of the bad economic times. This sequester is going to make it worse, and we'll discuss that.

What I am simply saying is that the gentleman is not serving the long-term interests of this institution, in my opinion, in not accurately describing what we're doing. That's what I said and that's what I mean.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman again that there are millions of people who have been impacted by the payroll tax going back into effect, and that affects not just the people making $400,000 and over—and he knows that as well as I do—but there are also millions of Americans now who are impacted by the ObamaCare tax that has gone into effect. So there are a lot of things that are going on. People in the private sector, the gentleman agrees, are suffering as well.

I just want to say I understand the gentleman. I think, long term, he and I both are interested in trying to get us on a plan to balance this budget so we can see growth return to the economy again and so everyone can see a day of higher wages and a future of better compensation. That's the goal, I think, all of us are driving towards.

Mr. HOYER. Of course, that's what we all agree on, but, frankly, that rhetoric does not substitute for action. Automatic budget cuts, known as the sequester, as you know, would cut U.S. growth in half in 2013 if allowed to go into effect. The CBO said that what we've already done has harmed the economy.

It is time for us to get on and deal with real solutions, not message bills as we did this week and as we did 2 weeks ago. That's all we've done. We met 6 or 7 days this month and last month in this Congress. We're dealing with message bills. The bill that we considered this week—the only bill of substance that we considered this week other than suspensions—will not have any positive effect on the sequester. The sequester is going to hurt our people; it's going to hurt jobs; it's going to hurt economic growth; it's going to do exactly the opposite of what the gentleman says—and I agree with him—that we agree ought to be our objectives.

As you know, the fiscal cliff deal postponed the sequester until March 1. Now, an overwhelming number of your folks did not vote for that, of course. The gentleman did, and I joined him in that effort. We've postponed that until March 1, the sequester. We're 20 days away from the sequester. We didn't do anything about it 2 weeks ago; we didn't do anything about it this week; and we're apparently not going to do anything about it next week either. There is no legislation which has been proposed by the majority party to make sure that the sequester does not go into effect.

The President of the United States spoke about that yesterday. Mr. VAN HOLLEN had a proposal to specifically deal with the sequester, to specifically preclude the sequester from going into effect, from specifically precluding the adverse effects that are going to occur to our national security structure and to our non-defense discretionary spending structure. We still now haven't seen anything from your party that would help stop the problem of the sequester. I was deeply upset that you did not make in order the Van Hollen alternative. Clearly, that alternative would have made a very substantial difference on the sequester. The President would have signed that, and the Senate, in my view, would have passed it, but we didn't even get to consider it on the floor.

Mr. Majority Leader, we are either going to consider alternatives—and I read the majority leader's speech yesterday about reaching out and doing things in a bipartisan way. One way we can do that is to allow both sides to offer their alternatives and have an up-or-down vote and to let the American people make a judgment on that. Very frankly, I think that the American people would have said that the Van Hollen alternative was the preferable alternative to the sequester. Now, there are a lot of your Members who apparently think the sequester is okay.

In your own quote, Mr. Majority Leader:

> Under the sequester, unemployment would soar from its current level up to 9 percent, setting back any progress the economy has made. According to the same study, the jobs of more than 200,000 Virginians, in my home State, are on the line.

That's what you said on September 13, 2012. I think you were right. I applaud you for that statement, but I regret that we had no legislation put on this floor 2 weeks ago, this week, or in your announcement next week to preclude the sequester from going into effect, which you say, Mr. Majority Leader—and I agree with you—will have an adverse effect on up to 200,000 Virginians.

Another quote from Representative ROONEY, with which I agree:

> We've tried to replace the sequester with other things, but it seems now that the large portion of our Conference is resigned to the fact that sequestration is okay.

Mr. ROONEY correctly says it's not okay—that it's dangerous, a huge mistake, a threat to our liberty. That's what TOM ROONEY of Florida said, and I applaud him for that statement, and I think he's accurate.

BILL YOUNG, who has made his whole life's career in making sure that we have a strong national security, said this:

''I'm reading what a lot of different Members are saying, and I find,'' lamentably—that's my word, not his—''there is not as much opposition to sequestration as I thought there might be.''

In other words, a lot of your folks are saying that sequestration is the way to go. In fact, Representative JOHN SHIMKUS said:

> He, President Obama, can announce all he wants, Sequestration is coming. It's coming. We've got to get spending cuts—no new revenue. It's all about spending.

So he is welcoming the sequester.

TOM COBURN:

> I think sequester is going to happen. I think people want it to happen.

I don't want it to happen, Mr. Leader. I don't think it ought to happen. I think it's going to be bad for the country if sequester happens.

□ 1220

The President doesn't want sequester, HARRY REID doesn't want sequester, and I don't want sequester. I would hope, based upon your comment that I just quoted, that you don't want sequester, but we're not going to get away from the sequester unless there's legislation that you bring to this floor—and you have the authority to do that—which will obviate going to sequester and will put in place an alternative which will do what you and I both want to do, and that is address the deficit and debt, both short term and long term.

Senator MIKE JOHANNS said:

> I just have a feeling sequester's going to happen. I just think there's so much concern about the debt and spending that it overrides most issues these days.

Now, those ''most issues'' are those 200,000 people that you talked about in your statement.

Senator AYOTTE said:

> Looks like where we're headed, sequestration.

JOHN CORNYN:

> The sequester is the only cuts we've got right now.

So that the consequences of the sequester, apparently, are not something he wants to avoid.

> Gridlock is leading to spending reductions. If the government does nothing, spending goes down. We have to claim victory.

Congressman MULVANEY from South Carolina said that.

Now, in terms of the sequester, I want to point out to you that there's been some comments on your side that this is the President's initiative. That is absolutely 100 percent inaccurate. In fact, the alternative in your Cut, Cap and Balance bill—and I know the majority leader knows it—is sequester; that's the fallback. We put sequester in place thinking it was so irrational and would have such a negative effect that clearly we would address the matter in the last 14 months. We didn't. We ought not to quit trying to do it, though—getting an alternative. Mr. VAN HOLLEN had an alternative.

As a matter of fact, in terms of the agreement that we reached, Speaker BOEHNER said, back on August 1, 2011:

When you look at this final agreement that we came to with the White House, I got 98 percent of what I wanted. I'm pretty happy.

That's JOHN BOEHNER's quote.

So it's not as if this was our deal. The Speaker says he got 98 percent of what he wanted. Now he says sequester is happening because the President didn't lead. Respectfully, I think that is totally, absolutely inaccurate. The President was prepared to be supportive of Mr. VAN HOLLEN's alternative yesterday. You can say you want a plan. That was his plan. We offered it. That was Mr. VAN HOLLEN's plan we offered. That was our Democratic alternative, and it would have avoided sequester.

So I say to the gentleman, I'm disappointed that the schedule does not reflect substantive, meaningful legislation to avoid the sequester which we certainly don't want. I don't know about your side based upon the quotes that I've just given you, but I would hope that the majority leader would, with the Speaker and with others in his caucus, seriously think about next week making in order a substantive alternative to the sequester.

Mr. PRICE says we did something in the last Congress. The last Congress is gone. You passed something in the last Congress. If you want to bring that to the floor and pass it again, you know the Senate won't pass it and the President won't sign it. The fact of the matter is we've got to get to compromise, Mr. Leader; and if we don't get to compromise, we're not going to get a solution to sequester or to bringing our debt and deficit down.

I'm glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would just say simply, Mr. Speaker, once again what we hear from the gentleman and his caucus is let's raise taxes; that'll fix the problem. And we all know the problem is spending.

The gentleman correctly refers to two bills that we had on the floor last year, one earlier in the year and one in the fall, both of which were designed to address the real problems as he suggests we need to do about the spending and the growth in the entitlement areas, which he knows as well as I are the main drivers of the deficit. We passed that bill without any help from the gentleman's side of the aisle and without any reciprocation from the Senate—nothing. The Senate did not move, and the White House did not move.

So if the gentleman suggests there's no compromising going on, I'd ask him how is it that the White House or the Senate is compromising at all if all we hear again and again is just take more money from the American people; that'll fix the problem.

No, Mr. Speaker, that's just kicking the can, and that's why we don't want to take up the other gentleman from Maryland's bill that the Democratic whip suggests, because it's just raising more taxes, not to mention the fact that it was not germane today. And the gentleman, as a protector of this institution knows, you can't bring up an alternative or an amendment that's not germane. You can, but it's not protecting this institution.

So I say to the gentleman, please, let's sit down together and address the real problem, not raise more taxes and kick the can. That's the uncompromising position that seems to dominate the majority party in this town, which is that controlled by the Senate and the White House, Mr. Speaker. The Democrats are constantly saying, Let's just raise more taxes. Take more money from the American people so we can fix the problem and keep spending their money. That's not the direction that we want to go in.

And I'll say to the gentleman, we want to do real fixes. We have consistently, as the gentleman knows, we have put out there and said here's our prescription to balance the budget; right? And we've said, Please, Senate, move. Let's hear your plan. Mr. President, please, you've missed the deadline again. Let's see your plan. Let's show it to the American people and have the discussion about the proper way to manage down this debt and deficit.

But nothing; nothing yet.

I will say to the gentleman what he calls a message bill is now law. And so with that bill, we'll see what the Senate says about managing down this debt and deficit. And hopefully, if the PLAN Act were to ever be taken up by the Senate, we'd have the President say, Here's how I'm going to balance the budget, here's how long it'll take, and here's how I'm going to do it.

That's the rational way to approach when you have two sides taking different approaches to the same problem.

Mr. Speaker, we just had a one-way effort here asking the gentleman, Please join us. Please join us in fixing the long-term problems; otherwise, we're going to keep mounting the debt that is facing us, our children and theirs, and we're going to be looking at the end of the situation that's just not what the American people want.

So I know the gentleman said, you know, let's just keep spending now, keep taxing. That doesn't help. That doesn't help long term. And we're trying to do long-term planning to get this country back on track.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

It's good spin, but it's not substance. It was a silly bill. The Senate passed it and the President signed it because it was the only way we could make sure that we did not put the creditworthiness of the United States at risk because we're playing this game of chicken because there are some people in this Congress who believe that putting America's creditworthiness at risk is a worthwhile objective. We reject that out of hand.

And I continue to believe that it was a silly bill that we passed. Yes, it was a bill that the President signed because he wanted to make sure that we didn't default on our debts, and we tried to give some confidence, as the gentleman talked about for years, to the economy. So, yes, he signed the bill, but it had nothing to do with obviating the sequester.

The bill that we passed today affects no substantive progress—none, zero, zip. And the gentleman talks about your plan. The Ryan plan, as the gentleman well knows, does not balance the budget until well into the thirties, late into the thirties, 2030s; and, therefore, heaven knows what's going happen in the next 25 years.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I hear the gentleman's objections to our plan and our prior budget. We're going to come forward with another budget that will balance in 10 years.

Mr. HOYER. I'm looking forward to that.

Mr. CANTOR. Where is the gentleman's plan? Where is the President's plan? Where is the other body's plan to balance this budget? That's all we're saying. If we can just get down to an equal level of discussion and say let's do the adult thing and try and resolve the mounting unfunded liabilities of this Federal Government, we can actually make some progress and get on about the business of helping people in this country, making their life better and making their future better, and that's the goal, instead of trying to go in and just intermittently kick the can because there's never any attempt to resolve long-term problems. That's where we're coming from.

□ 1230

Mr. HOYER. Well, as the gentleman knows, I've been one of the leaders, certainly on this side, and in this House, to get to a balanced plan. A balanced plan, yes, does include revenues. You want to say get more money from the American people.

We buy things. As a people, we buy things. People send us here, 435 districts, and we vote on buying things. One of the things we bought, of course, was defending ourselves from terrorists, both in Iraq and in Afghanistan. It cost us $1.3-, $1.4 trillion when you were fully in charge. We paid zero for it. That's the largest expenditure, other than the two tax cuts which we did in 2001 and 2003, which we did not pay for by cutting spending, which you say is the problem.

You didn't cut spending when you were fully in charge of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. That's one of the reasons the Tea Party was so angry at some of your people, because they felt you all were in charge and you didn't cut spending. Maybe some of the people in this Chamber share that view.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HOYER. Let me finish my thought, if I can, Mr. Leader.

So I say to you, right now, you're talking about a plan. PAUL RYAN said yesterday the Founding Fathers would be upset with the President for not coming up with a plan. The Constitution contemplates the President having very little, if any role, other than execution of the budget in the budget process. That didn't come until the last century.

The fact of the matter is it is our responsibility. Not a nickel can be spent in America unless the Congress authorizes it to be spent. The President can't spend money on his own. Not a nickel can be raised in this country, of revenue, without the Congress acting on it. The President can't do that.

It is the Congress of the United States, under article I, that has this responsibility. We're not taking that responsibility. We're trying to shove it off on somebody else, in this case, the President of the United States.

The President has a plan. He's offered it a number of times. I just read a book that discussed our discussions for some period of time with the President on his plan. He's sent budgets down here. Your side doesn't like his plan because it involves revenues.

There is not a bipartisan commission that I know of that has not suggested, in order to solve our debt and deficit problem, that we don't have to have a balanced plan, which will involve revenues and will involve cuts in spending, cuts in spending to entitlements, cuts in spending to discretionary spending. I agree with that.

I'll now yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, we just raised taxes. We just put more revenue in the mix, $650 billion over 10 years, and got no cuts. No cuts.

And the gentleman talked about the 2001, 2003 tax cuts without paying for them. You know, we just extended most of those tax measures and relief to people under $400,000 with no cuts. Nothing. So, again, I don't think it's right to be saying that we need more revenues now. We already did revenues, right? We already have $650 billion.

Why does the gentleman continue to think, Mr. Speaker, that that's what we have to keep doing? It's not the answer.

Let's get to the problem that is causing the mounting deficits. It's a lack of growth, and it's the spending that's out of control.

Mr. HOYER. We're not going to resolve this argument, Mr. Speaker. It's the same litany on both sides. The difference is, the gentleman cannot name a bipartisan commission that doesn't say that we need both sides of the equation addressed if we're going to get from where we are to where we need to be.

On my side, we have to deal across the board with spending. You're correct on that. On your side, you're going to have deal with revenues. A lot of your people understand that, like Mr. COBURN and others. I won't mention anybody on this side of the aisle because I don't want to get them in hot water, but they all understand that.

And what you're saying is, the Senate needs to compromise, the President needs to compromise by doing it your way. That won't work. Your way or the highway is not the way we're going to have compromise.

Mr. CANTOR. What about the revenues we already have now done? These are $650 billion, Mr. Speaker, already raised, no cuts.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time if I can, the gentleman voted for the Budget Control Act. How much in cuts were in the Budget Control Act? $1.2 trillion, as I recall, or $1 trillion, excuse me, $1 trillion, which is why we had the Supercommittee to get the additional 1.2 that the Speaker said he wanted.

So your side assumed that we'd already done a trillion of the $2.2 trillion that the Speaker said was necessary. So the Speaker and your side, I presume, already adopted the premise that we'd cut $1 trillion in the Budget Control Act.

Now, do we need more? I think the answer to that is yes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, in his proposal, made some cuts. I'm not saying you should have supported it. I'm saying you should have allowed the American people to have that alternative on the floor to consider.

You say it wasn't germane. You and I both know—you know the Rules Committee process as well as I do—we could have waived that because the issue in front of us immediately—we're talking about the long term—immediately, is in 22 days, or 23 days, we're going to have a sequester. Almost everybody agrees that the sequester will have an adverse impact on the economy, and on our national security, and on discretionary programs because it would be irrationally done, across the board, without recognition of priority status.

So that I tell my friend, I regret that we're not dealing with the sequester. I would hope the gentleman would put legislation on the floor next week to deal with the sequester, deal with an alternative to the sequester, not talk about what we did last Congress. We didn't agree with that. You're right. We voted against it. But put something on the floor that deals with the sequester.

And I will tell my friend, I liked his speech. And he said again today he wants to work in a bipartisan fashion.

The fact of the matter is, we had an election, and in the election the American people said they thought the President's view had merit, which was a balanced approach. Yes, revenue, but also cuts in spending. And the Senate expanded its numbers, notwithstanding the fact that they agreed with the President's position and not with yours. And, in fact, more people voted for Democrats in the House of Representatives than voted for Republicans, but the redistricting resulted in your continuing to have the majority.

So we have a joint responsibility to get there. And I would urge the gentleman to please consider putting something on the floor, not these message bills, but putting something on the floor that will substantively deal with avoiding the sequester.

Now let me go on to another issue that I know that the gentleman's been working on, and that's the Violence Against Women Act. I know he's been working, he said, with Vice President BIDEN, who was very involved in this. Can the gentleman tell me the status of that piece of legislation?

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman knows that my office and his have been in discussions about this bill. I have had daily meetings to try and get to a point where we can bring this forward. You know, I, as the gentleman does, care very deeply about women and the abuse situation, that we need to get them the relief that this bill offers. That's what we want to do. That's our priority.

We must move and act on this bill, and I've, as well, been in touch with the Vice President and his office about trying to assist in bringing the parties together because, as the gentleman knows, there's been the introduction of some issues that are not directly related to the situation of domestic abuse on tribal lands because that's what we're trying to get at. We want to protect the women who are subject to abuse on tribal lands.

And unfortunately, there are issues that don't directly bear on that that have come up that have complicated it, as the gentleman knows. But in working with his office, as well as the Vice President's, I hope to be able to deal with this, bring it up in an expeditious manner.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I thank him for his work on this as well. This is a critically important issue, and I am hopeful that we can come to an agreement which will provide for the passage of that piece of legislation and send it to the President. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, February 8, 2013; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, February 12, 2013, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

□ 1240

PROMOTING MANUFACTURING AND A THRIVING ECONOMY

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage this body to support our Nation's vital manufacturing sector by reducing burdensome regulations. Nearly 12 million Americans—almost 10 percent of the workforce—are employed directly in manufacturing. During last week's district work period, I had the opportunity to visit part of that workforce at the Tenneco facility in Hartwell, as well as the SKF Industries plant in Flowery Branch. I'm proud of the topnotch work being done by Georgia manufacturers. Companies like SKF have been recognized for the high level of investment the company places in employees. Last month, the Greater Hall Chamber of Commerce awarded SKF for its employee recognition efforts.

Manufacturing provides a great opportunity for folks, including those in Hartwell and Flowery Branch, to work hard and earn a good living so they can provide for their families. We cannot let their livelihood be threatened by out-of-control Federal regulations. I stand ready to work with my colleagues to promote a reasonable regulatory framework that will help manufacturing and our entire economy to thrive.

CELEBRATING PRESIDENT RONALD WILSON REAGAN'S 102ND BIRTHDAY

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 102nd birthday of Ronald Reagan, the 40th President of the United States. I take this opportunity to again thank Mrs. Reagan and the Reagan family for sharing their husband and father with this country. Their sacrifices allowed this Nation to move from an era of doubt and decline into one of a brighter future.

Today, we find ourselves facing another era of doubt and decline: chronic unemployment, staggering debt, international crises, and advocates of Big Government pushing for more failed Big Government to fix our problems. I suggest that those who think America cannot turn the state of affairs around to think again. As President Reagan said—and these words are inscribed at his final resting place in California:

> I know in my heart that man is good. That what is right will always eventually triumph. And there's purpose and worth to each and every life.

With that perspective, let us again renew our commitment with President Reagan's trademark optimism to a renewal of the American spirit and a relighting of the American Dream.

PASSAGE OF THE FARM BILL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, without reforms, by the year 2020, the interest alone paid on our national debt by American taxpayers will cost $1 trillion per year—money that could otherwise be used to educate our kids or put aside for those most in need. Most would agree that borrowing on the backs of our children to pay for promises our government cannot keep must end, and that only together, through the collaboration of both parties, can we assure America begins to live within its means.

During the last Congress there was one area where both parties came together. It was an effort that made improvements in programs resulting in better use of each tax dollar. It was an effort that also achieved deficit reduction. This effort was the farm bill.

Many of us are eager to hear the President's plan to help the Nation achieve fiscal balance during next week's State of the Union. I encourage the President to elevate passage of a new farm bill to the forefront of the speech. It's good policy. It's one area where we can come together and start the path of fiscal balance. I encourage my leaders in the House to welcome this call.

HONORING LEE RUSH

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true leader in my district back home in Pennsylvania, Mr. Lee Rush, who 10 years ago founded a community nonprofit organization known as justCommunity. Its mission is to provide consultation, education, and training services in the areas of youth development and substance abuse prevention, both very important goals.

In light of his exceptional efforts and initiative, Lee has been named an Advocate of the Year by the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America and will be receiving that distinction tomorrow, February 7. I couldn't be more proud of him.

Lee's achievements and steadfast leadership have positively impacted the youth and communities of Pennsylvania. It's been an honor to get to know Lee personally and to witness his accomplishments firsthand. I know that he will keep up the outstanding work.

THE GLOBAL JIHADIST THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, outgoing Secretary of State Hillary Clinton recently issued a stern warning in her testimony before the House and Senate committees responsible for oversight of U.S. foreign policy. She referred repeatedly to the need for our country to recognize and respond to what she called a ''global jihadist threat.''

Mr. Speaker, rarely have I agreed more with Secretary Clinton. Yet if Mrs. Clinton has been worried about this threat before now, she has done an impressive job of concealing it. The same is true of the Obama administration more generally. For the past 4 years, the executive branch has gone to extraordinary lengths to obscure the danger posed by those who practice holy war, or jihad, against our country. The administration has also sought to silence, and in some cases punish, those who have spoken the truth about this menace.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely welcome the Secretary's warning, belated though it may be. However, it would have served this country and the cause of freedom far more if she had so openly recognized the threat posed by militant Islamic jihad—and to have led in countering it—at any point during her tenure other than its conclusion.

One of the most important architects of that see-no-jihad policy over the past 4 years has been John Brennan, President Obama's homeland security advisor and his pick to become the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. In May, 2010, Mr. Brennan publicly declared that:

> We do not describe our enemy as ''jihadists'' or ''Islamists'' because jihad is a holy struggle, a legitimate tenet of Islam, meaning to purify oneself or one's community, and there is nothing holy or legitimate or Islamic about murdering innocent men, women, and children.

Mr. Speaker, the unavoidable reality is that self-described jihadists have routinely gone about murdering innocent women and children for decades. It should alarm us all that neither John Brennan nor Hillary Clinton—nor seemingly anyone else in the Obama administration—has fully recognized the scope of this jihadist threat. They seem blind to the fact that the Islamic jihadists here and elsewhere in the West are even now engaging in a pre-violent form of holy war against infidels and the free world. And the administration has refused to face the incontrovertible fact that the driving force behind this practice is the Muslim Brotherhood. The brothers themselves call this form of holy war ''civilization jihad.''

Mr. Speaker, this reality is in direct conflict with the Obama administration's insistence—long-promoted by John Brennan—that we confront only al Qaeda and its affiliates. We are told that we can safely cultivate relations with ''moderates'' in Islamist groups like Hezbollah and the Muslim Brotherhood. This has led to helping

jihadists extend their power elsewhere and allowed them to gain dangerous footholds in America.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, we need as a Nation to understand the true nature and ominous implications of the global jihadist threat in both its violent and pre-violent forms.

The unavoidable truth is that there are individuals who adhere to a political Islamist doctrine of shari'a, and they are willing to become involved in the jihad it commands, and they pose a potential mortal threat to this Nation and its people. And Congress has a duty, Mr. Speaker, among other things, to question the ways in which such individuals and organizations tied to the Muslim Brotherhood have been given access to and preferential treatment from the Obama administration.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the success of this stealth jihad has been significantly enhanced by remarks and public statements made by John Brennan over the past 4 years. He should, therefore, not be allowed anywhere near—let alone actually be given responsibility for running—America's premiere intelligence agency.

It is my hope that, among other things, my remarks on the floor today will encourage our colleagues in the Senate to scrutinize critically the record and judgment of John Brennan and his suitability for the job of CIA Director.

Mr. Speaker, may I commend to my colleagues on both sides of Capitol Hill regarding this issue and to the American people a powerful new documentary that examines, in part, some of the issues I have discussed today and their grave implications for our national security, public safety, and freedoms. This documentary, entitled, ''The Grand Deception,'' is a product of counterterrorism expert Steven Emerson's Investigative Project on Terrorism, and it provides critical insights into the true nature of the ''global jihadist threat,'' including its expanding successes overseas and the danger it poses here at home. It chronicles the history of what I believe has been an officially sanctioned and willful blindness to that threat. It also lays bare the various ways in which such a practice is contributing to the emboldening of our enemies, the undermining of our allies, and the steady erosion of our economy and our security.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by noting, as the previous gentleman did, that today is Ronald Reagan's birthday. It is particularly appropriate to recall on Mr. Reagan's birthday his admonition of August 1961. He said:

> Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States when men were free.

Mr. Speaker, today, in our time, we also face the prospect of a generational threat to freedom. We must bend every effort to awakening our countrymen to that threat and equip them to contend with it, and we must ensure that our government's policies and our capabilities are conducive to and employed effectively to fight for our freedom, to protect it, and to hand it on to future generations in the hope that they will do the same.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, John Brennan has shown himself time and again to be at cross-purposes with those requirements. For that reason alone, his nomination must be rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

NATIONAL SECURITY ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 54 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, the first thing I would like to do is yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CARDISS COLLINS, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

I rise to pay tribute to the predecessor of my office, who served for 23 years as a Member of the House, the Honorable Cardiss Collins, who passed away on Saturday evening here in the District area.

I followed Ms. Collins into Congress when she retired. She followed her husband, who was killed in an airplane accident. The amazing thing about her was that she basically had no political involvement and experience from that vantage point. She was an accountant, who also was a housewife and involved a bit in local politics. But she got involved and was a quick study, immediately grasped what takes place here, ultimately became chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, became chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, had an outstanding career, and I simply wanted to acknowledge her work.

People of her community will remember the legacy that she created as a fighter for women's rights, as a defender of children's rights, and a real defender of health care.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. DAVIS. It's my pleasure to have had the opportunity to yield to you. It's one of the things that's good if we do more of, and that is recognizing people for their great contributions to this country.

At this time, I want to pick up where my friend, Mr. FRANKS, left off and follow up on the issue of who will be the next CIA Director. This is an important matter.

Some think, well, what difference does the past make? Today is a new day. Every day is a new day. But those of us who majored in history, studied history, know that our history is the best indication of future performance.

So with regard to Mr. Brennan, I think it's worth noting that Secretary of State—former Secretary of State now—Hillary Clinton warned on her way out as Secretary of State of the danger of what she called the ''global jihadist threat.'' I am greatly appreciative to Secretary Clinton for calling this administration's attention to that, as well as the American public. Secretary Clinton should know. We had at least four Americans killed at Benghazi during her watch as Secretary of State.

The question might be: Where is John Brennan today on this central challenge of our time for Western civilization? And by ''Western civilization,'' I mean the idea that the Founders of this Nation had, many of them depicted in the great mural just outside this floor, 56 signers of the Declaration in the mural that John Trumble did down in the Rotunda. Their idea, when you read their writings, was of a people who would have the chance to govern themselves.

They all knew that prayer was important. That's why as Ben Franklin said during the Constitutional Convention—his own handwriting, he wrote out his speech, but he mentioned that during the revolution, in his words:

> We had daily prayer in this room. Our prayers, sir, were heard and they were graciously answered.

They understood that. They prayed for wisdom. They prayed for guidance. They prayed for help in setting up this experiment in democracy. Yes, Rome had had a Senate. Yes, Greece had had a Senate; England had had a Parliament. But they had rulers who could just disband, kill, dismiss. This was going to be different. This was going to be a people who would have the chance to actually govern themselves, a revolutionary idea.

There was still such a class system in so many areas of the world in the 1700s that so many considered that people who were not of the upper crust would not have the ability to govern themselves. That's not what the Founders believed after they prayed each day during the revolution, after they prayed and struggled and argued over the way forward to reaching that goal.

But there is a threat, as Secretary Clinton said, the global jihadist threat, of people who think that the Founders' dream is totally inappropriate, that it leads to degradation; it leads to moral depravity, in their minds.

□ 1300

The Founders knew that was a possibility, but it was worth the risk to give people the freedom of choice as they believed their creator had given all of us, to make decisions for good or bad, and normally to have to live with the consequences of those decisions.

The global jihadist threat that Secretary Clinton pointed out does not have the belief that a democracy is a good idea, that a people electing representatives in a republican form of government is a good idea. They believe that we need some religious leader, like the Ayatollah Khomeini, or now Khamenei in Iran, we need a religious leader like that, that tells us what we can do, that makes all his decisions under shari'a law.

Now, all of those who met during the revolution, they believed in the power of prayer to God, and that's why they prayed during that time. But they wanted everyone to have the chance to worship as they chose, be they Muslim, Hindu, but especially Judeo-Christian beliefs where Jews and Christians had traditionally suffered persecution. They wanted the chance for people to worship as they please, or not worship. But they knew to make that possible they had to pray to God.

And that's why we are observing, once again, tomorrow the National Prayer Breakfast where our President will speak, where we will have a fantastic testimony from one of the great leaders in our country, who earlier in his life, when his life was going astray, dropped to his knees and prayed for help and got it. We will hear about that tomorrow.

But if we don't know the history of this country, if we don't know the dream of the Founders, if we don't understand the Constitution, then we lose it. And people need to understand when there is a global jihadist threat, not of moderate Muslims, like our friends, the Northern Alliance, who fought and defeated the Taliban on our behalf, not the enemy of our enemies, but these are radical Islamic jihadists who want a caliphate in which the United States is subjugated to a religious ruler.

And they're willing to use violence, if necessary. Although the Muslim Brotherhood now seems to indicate that here in America they've made so much progress in infiltrating and getting positions of power in our government, in our State Department, in our Homeland Security Department, in our Justice Department, at the White House directly, direct lines to the President, they have made so much progress in moving toward that goal of a caliphate here in the United States, under shari'a law, not under the Constitution, that they're thinking maybe violence is not the way forward in America to achieve their goal of making this a shari'a compliant caliphate.

But the Muslim Brotherhood around the world believes in many places violence is the way forward in those areas. But we've got to understand who we are facing and what they want to do. And Secretary Clinton, unfortunately it is on her way out that she notes this, instead of being able to spend the last four years with the clarity she had when she said that we face this danger of a global jihadist threat. It is a threat. She now acknowledges it on her way out.

And the question now is, since Secretary of State Kerry will now be carrying that mantle, for heaven's sake we have got to have somebody in intelligence directing intelligence who understands the threat against us and will ensure that we are protected and understands the global jihadist threat.

The Obama administration has focused almost entirely on al Qaeda, believing people when they came in and said, ''Look, the only people who can actually give you advice on dealing with these radical folks are Islamic believers, so you must get advice from us, form partnerships with us, let us give you advice, let us tell you how to deal with this threat.'' And they made great inroads in this administration in that approach.

But the blindness of the larger jihadist threat, the enterprise that is being pursued by the Muslim Brotherhood abroad, has resulted in the practice of drone-delivered assassinations of al Qaeda figures, with what many are questioning or arguing is due process without that, and this administration's repeated declaration that al Qaeda is being defeated. They know not of what they speak.

The idea that al Qaeda is being defeated is helping recruit others who are radical jihadists, because they're able to point to a United States administration that is so blind and so uninformed of what really is going on, that they think al Qaeda is on the decline when radical jihad is on its way up.

The drone technique of killing American citizens and killing radical jihadists is apparently thought by this administration to be a very advanced and practical approach. Well, it does avoid putting Americans at risk right now. But those same people in this administration that talked about the danger of waterboarding because, yes, some acknowledge we got very critical information by using that, even though there was no threat to their health, you had doctors there, there was no intention to do any harm. The intent was to perform a procedure that did not harm but would gather information.

Well, this administration ran against JOHN MCCAIN, and even though JOHN MCCAIN agreed, yeah, we don't want to waterboard, we don't want to do anything that somebody might someday call torture, they complained, gee, this is allowing radicals to be recruited against the United States because of the unjust nature of doing a procedure that is not harmful to someone's health to gather information to save American lives, which it did.

So here we are now with this administration that thought waterboarding helped jihadists recruit more radicals, using a process of having a high administration official think to himself or herself, ''I don't think this may be enough, yeah, blow them up,'' without giving adequate consideration to civilians who will be killed, to family members who will be upset, to the ability of our enemies to use that to recruit other radicals many times over to replace those that have been killed with a drone strike.

This administration's systemic failure to understand what the Muslim Brotherhood calls ''civilization jihad'' is putting this country in severe jeopardy. That's why I appreciate Secretary Clinton, on her way out, unfortunately, pointing back to the danger of this global jihadist threat.

According to the—and this is the name of the document—''Explanatory Memorandum on the General Strategic Goal for the Brotherhood in North America,'' the mission of the Muslim Brotherhood is this:

''A civilization-jihadist process—a kind of grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and sabotaging its miserable house by their,'' i.e. Americans', ''hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and Allah's religion is made victorious over all other religions.''

□ 1310

The mission statement I've just quoted translates into a comprehensive effort to penetrate, to influence, and otherwise subvert our American civil society, our form of government, our governing institutions. And that explanatory memorandum that I just quoted from was written on May 19, 1991 by a top Muslim Brotherhood operative, Mohamed Akram.

Though the Justice Department established in Federal court during the Holy Land Foundation trials in Dallas, Texas, that the groups identified by the Muslim Brotherhood in their memo are ''their organizations,'' a number of them and their successors have been treated by the Obama administration as key interlocutors in dealing with radical jihad, and this administration believes that these Muslim Brotherhood front organizations are legitimate representatives of the Muslim American community.

They have enabled the Muslim Brotherhood to recruit and to show others, Look, we're the ones that the White House trusts. We can call the White House. We can call and tell them there are three people who are giving a seminar at Langley—CIA headquarters—to law officers, hundreds of them, and we believe they will be teaching them things that are offensive to us. Well, yeah, because they call them what they are. They read from their own documents.

These individuals, who have spent their careers learning and teaching about the threat of what Secretary Clinton called the global jihadist threat, were stopped in August a year and a half ago by a call to the White House. That call also was instrumental in prompting this administration through the intelligence department, the Justice Department, the FBI, all these departments, into purging documents, purging words, purging things from our materials that someone who

wants to destroy our way of life and take us over and make us a caliphate may be offended by.

I can't go into what has been purged because they decided to declare it a classified setting when MICHELE BACHMANN and I—and for a while LYNN WESTMORELAND—went through documents to see what had been purged, documents that we knew before we went in had supposedly been purged because someone who wants to destroy our way of life might be offended.

Well, I am offended, every American should be offended, and every Muslim should be offended that a governing administration put the feelings of people who want to destroy us ahead of their oath to protect this Nation and preserve the Constitution. It doesn't mean anything to preserve the Constitution if you preserve the document but you do not preserve the enumerated powers and laws set out in that document.

Last June, four of my colleagues and I wrote to five different departments in this administration. In each separate letter—each was different—we wrote to the inspector general of each department, and we pointed out in each letter specific facts about that department that should give rise to an investigation into the influence of people who have embraced the idea of civilization jihad and taking this country over and subjugating us to sharia law and a religious leader who could tell us how to avoid moral depravity.

There was such an uproar, even by some Republicans—by a few of them, anyway. But some in the media went ballistic. Instead of doing their own investigation, they start blaming the messenger. But I don't hear any of those people attacking Secretary Clinton on her way out for saying, By the way, there is a global jihadist threat. It's what we've been trying to tell people for a couple of years, at least. There is a global jihadist threat. Thank you, Secretary Clinton. You're right.

Now, for this administration to bring people into top positions who do not understand the threat to this country and think that ignoring due process of our Constitution and killing American citizens with drone bombs is somehow preserving the Constitution, it requires another look. It requires oversight. There may be circumstances where that's what needs to be done. But I do find it interesting that this administration and certain leaders here on the Hill had no problem with al Awlaki leading prayers here at the Capitol, here on Capitol Hill, prayers by al Awlaki that were videotaped, that you can still find. He led prayers on Capitol Hill, and then he goes to Yemen, and this administration thinks we better kill him with a drone without due process. What were they afraid of? Maybe that he would come back and lead prayers on Capitol Hill, or maybe he would be captured and talk about who all he led prayers with on Capitol Hill? What was the need for taking this man out?

We're told he had blood on his hands, and so it does seem. But there seems to be a problem when leaders of this country will say you cannot waterboard to get information, even though it's not a threat to the health of the individual—it scares them—but we will take an American citizen out who not so long before was leading prayers of Muslim staff members here at this Capitol on Capitol Hill.

It would be a grave mistake for our Senate to confirm John Brennan as the chief architect that he has been for his failure to understand and comprehend the global jihadist threat that Secretary Clinton has noted going out.

There was an article today, February 6, by Jim Geraghty, and I'm quoting from the article:

Let me throw you a curveball by quoting Adam Serwer of Mother Jones, reacting to the administration's release of its legal justification to kill Americans believed to be involved with terror without a trial, by drone.

□ 1320

Let me parenthetically note here that I'm not someone who comes to the table without an understanding about trials, about evidence, about due process, about constitutional rights, and about a death sentence. I've signed death sentences. It's a heavy, weighty matter, and as someone who has believed in capital punishment in the right circumstances, it's still a challenging moment when you watch your hand sign an order to have someone put to death. I've done it twice. In both cases, the evidence was overwhelming beyond a reasonable doubt. The evidence was also overwhelming beyond a reasonable doubt that those two individuals murdered an individual or more, knew what they were doing when they murdered one or more individuals, were complicit in actually either murdering or participating in the murder, and that there was no evidence.

The question put to the jury: Is there any evidence that mitigates against the imposition of the death penalty as the Supreme Court has found? Any evidence. It's a "no evidence" question. Is there any evidence that mitigates against the death penalty? That's one of the three questions, and that's the standard. That's what juries in States that allow capital punishment have had to wrestle with, but I'd like to know who is considering those weighty issues in this administration.

So we go back to Geraghty's article. He quotes from Mother Jones:

> The Obama administration claims that the secret judgment of a single "well-informed, high-level administration official" meets the demands of due process and is sufficient justification to kill an American citizen suspected of working with terrorists. That procedure is entirely secret. Thus, it's impossible to know which rules the administration has established to protect due process and to determine how closely those rules are followed. The government needs the approval of a judge to detain a suspected terrorist. To kill one, however, it need only give itself permission.

Of course, the hypocrisy of most liberals doesn't get us off the hook on the need to have a coherent view on this. Okay, conservatives. Big question now: If this were President Romney, would we be shrugging, concerned, complaining or screaming? I think "concerned." At the very least, you would want another set of eyes—the House or Senate Intelligence Committees or some independent judges—taking a look at the Presidential "kill list"—right?—at least for the American citizens.

Our Charles C.W. Cooke said, "In case my position isn't obvious, I am appalled by any President processing the unilateral power to kill American citizens extrajudicially."

Senator Ron Wyden, Oregon Democrat, puts it rather bluntly: "Every American has the right to know when their government believes that it is allowed to kill them."

Geraghty finishes his article by saying, "That doesn't seem like too much to ask."

The article in Mother Jones is worth considering. It's dated Tuesday, February 5, posted at 8:53 a.m. Pacific Standard Time by Adam Serwer. It takes a good look at this issue.

So what is the result of this administration's deciding secretly or some bureaucrat's deciding, "Yeah, we've got enough. We'll kill this man. Yeah, we've got enough. We'll kill this person, this American citizen"? How is that working out?

There was an article published on January 31, 2013, by Catherine Herridge. Catherine has a great book out on radical Islam. This article Catherine has entitled, "Al Qaeda affiliate in Africa looking to strike more Western targets, intelligence officials say." She says in her article, quoting Secretary Clinton:

> "Yes, we now face a spreading jihadist threat. We have driven a lot of the al Qaeda operatives out of . . . Afghanistan, Pakistan. Killed a lot of them, including, of course, bin Laden, but we have to recognize this is a global movement."

My comment: It's not a movement that is simply attacking overseas in some foreign country. Anyway, it's a good article by Catherine Herridge. She understands the threat.

Let me read a quote directly from White House counterterrorism adviser and nominee for Director of the CIA, Mr. John Brennan. He said:

> Hezbollah started out as purely a terrorist organization back in the early eighties and has evolved significantly over time, and now it has members of parliament in the cabinet. There are lawyers, doctors, others who are part of the Hezbollah organization . . . and so, quite frankly, I'm pleased to see that a lot of Hezbollah individuals are, in fact, renouncing that type of terrorism and violence and are trying to participate in the political process in Lebanon in a very legitimate fashion.

They have not sworn off violence in Lebanon. They have not sworn off violence in Egypt, in Syria and, as we well know, in Libya, Albania, Tunisia, even in African nations further south.

I've said before and have expressed my concern of this administration in its helping people we didn't know for sure of their identities and in encouraging them to overthrow this Nation's

ally, President Mubarak. I expressed concerns before it was done about giving military assistance to people that we knew included al Qaeda to overthrow a man who had blood on his hands but, since 2003, had been this Nation's and this administration's ally, Qadhafi. They participated in taking him out—gave military aid to do so—to protect al Qaeda and other revolutionaries in setting up a government, a situation, that naturally was going to get Americans killed and which happened.

So I applaud Secretary Clinton for noting the global jihadist threat on her way out, but I come back to her question that will ring in people's ears for years to come when Senators were trying to get to the heart of the matter: What happened at Benghazi? Please just tell us what happened. We're not going to prosecute anybody here at the Senate. We just need to know what happened. Of her question, those words will ring: What difference does it make?

What difference does it make? Americans got killed.

I was inquiring: Does anybody know has a fifth person died of his wounds in Benghazi? What's going on? What's happening to those people who were wounded? Who can tell us what really happened?

What difference does it make? So we can avoid Americans being killed like that in the future.

What if we'd have had an adequate investigation about security at our Embassy back when Susan Rice was involved back in the nineties? Did they ask for extra security? Did you deny them that security? Did we have enough security? What happened to allow our Embassy to be bombed and Americans to be killed?

□ 1330

What difference does it make? Because if we'd known in the nineties what went wrong, maybe we could have avoided Chris Stevens, our SEALS, those four Americans that we know of being killed.

What difference does it make? It makes a difference to their families if they're alive today or dead because we were not properly secured.

What difference does it make? It makes a difference to future families who lose loved ones in the service of their country because people stonewalled and would not give us the information as to what went wrong, what happened. Just tell us.

We're supposed to trust the administration? Not only with a bureaucratic decision by one person that he think he's got enough information to go kill an American citizen without a trial, now we have to say, oh, well, we will trust them to make sure that nobody gets killed again, but it has already happened. And then by the stonewalling, we don't know enough about where the weapons came from. We don't know enough about what went wrong to know how those weapons that we may have provided in a country where we provided the revolutionary help, now has resulted in Americans and others being killed in Algeria.

What difference does it make? I'm sure the people who died in Algeria would like to have their family members back. That makes a difference.

What difference does it make? It doesn't make any difference if you don't care who lives or dies. But if you want to protect Americans in the service of their country, it makes a real difference. And it's our duty to try to protect them.

The New York Times had an article by Gregory Johnsen back in November titled ''The Wrong Man for the CIA.'' He said:

With the resignation of David H. Petraeus, President Obama now has a chance to appoint a new CIA director. Unfortunately, one of the leading candidates for the job is John O. Brennan, who is largely responsible for America's current flawed counterterrorism strategy, which relies too heavy on drone strikes that frequently kills civilians and provide al Qaeda with countless new recruits. Rather than keeping us safe, this strategy is putting the United States at greater risk.

For all of the Obama administration's foreign policy successes—from ending the war in Iraq to killing Osama bin Laden—the most enduring policy legacy of the past 4 years may well turn out to be an approach to counterterrorism that American officials call the Yemen model, a mixture of drone strikes and Special Forces raids targeting al Qaeda leaders.

Mr. Brennan is the President's chief counterterrorism adviser and the architect of this model. In a recent speech, he claimed that there was ''little evidence that these actions are generating widespread anti-American sentiment or recruits for AQAP,'' referring to al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.

Perhaps the initials ought to be, instead of AQAP, the initials the administration, the government likes to use, instead of AQAP, maybe it ought to be MBCH, the Muslim Brotherhood on Capitol Hill, where al Awlaki that this administration killed with a drone strike led prayers.

Back to the article:

Mr. Brennan's assertion was either shockingly naive or deliberately misleading. Testimonies from al Qaeda fighters and interviews I and local journalists have conducted across Yemen attest to the centrality of civilian casualties in explaining al Qaeda's rapid growth there.

Rapid growth there needs to be noted. People that have actually done an objective analysis have found al Qaeda is not diminished. Radicals are growing to the point that Secretary Clinton would note the jihadist threat as she leaves.

The article says:

The United States is killing women, children and members of key tribes. ''Each time they kill a tribesman, they create more fighters for al Qaeda,'' one Yemeni explained to me over tea in Sana, the capital, last month. Another told CNN, after a failed strike, ''I would not be surprised if 100 tribesmen joined al Qaeda as a result of the latest drone mistake.''

Rather than promote the author of a failing strategy, we need a CIA director who will halt the agency's creeping militarization and restore it to what it does best: collecting human intelligence. It is an intelligence agency, not a lightweight version of Joint Special Operations Command. And until America wins the intelligence war, missiles will continue to hit the wrong targets, kill too many civilians and drive young men into the waiting arms of our enemies.

Without accurate on-the-ground intelligence, our policies will fail. George W. Bush launched two major ground invasions, and Mr. Obama has tried several smaller wars. Neither strategy has worked. In Yemen, which has been the laboratory for Mr. Obama's shadow wars, AQAP has more than tripled in size after 3 years of drone strikes. When the United States started bombing Yemen in 2009, AQAP had just 200 to 300 fighters. Today, the State Department estimates it has a few thousand. Since 2009, the group has attempted to attack America on three occasions, coming closest on December 25, 2009, when a would-be suicide bomber narrowly failed to bring down an airliner over Detroit. When it tries again—and it will—the organization will be available to draw upon much deeper ranks.

Not surprisingly, American officials reject the claim that current policy is exacerbating the problem. In June 2011, Mr. Brennan declared that ''there hasn't been a single collateral death because of the exceptional proficiency, precision of the capabilities we've been able to develop.'' This came almost exactly a year after a botched drone attack in Yemen killed a deputy governor and four of his bodyguards instead of the intended target.

Under Mr. Brennan's guidance, the United States has also adopted a controversial method for determining how many civilians it has killed, counting all military-age males in a strike zone as combatants. This means that Abdulrahman al Awlaki, a 16-year-old American citizen killed by a drone in October, was classified as a militant despite evidence that he was simply a shy teenager whose father happened to be Anwar al Awlaki, who had been killed by American missiles 2 weeks earlier.

The strikes Mr. Brennan asks the President to approve frequently lead to civilian casualties. Indeed, the first strike Mr. Obama ordered on Yemen, in December 2009, destroyed a Bedouin village that was mistaken for a terrorist training camp. American missiles killed more than 50 people, including 35 women and children. Watching that strike live on a grainy feed the military calls Kill TV, Jeh Johnson, the Pentagon's top lawyer, later admitted, ''if I were Catholic, I'd have to go to confession.''

Mr. Petraeus's departure presents Mr. Obama with an opportunity to halt the CIA's drift toward becoming a paramilitary organization and put it back on course. For all of the technological advances America has made in a decade of fighting al Qaeda, it still needs all of the old tricks it learned in the days before spy satellites and drones.

More and better intelligence from sources on the ground would result in more accurate targeting and fewer civilian casualties. That would be a Yemen model that actually worked and a lasting and effective counterterrorism legacy for Mr. Obama's second term.

That's Gregory Johnson from The New York Times.

Another good article by Patrick Poole on June 6 of 2012, ''Meet John Brennan, Obama's Assassination Czar.''

A relatively unnoticed article by Associated Press reporter Kimberly Dozier 2 weeks ago outlined new Obama administration policy changes which consolidated power for authorizing drone attacks and assassinations

under political appointees within the White House.

The article identifies White House Counterterrorism Chief John Brennan as the official assuming the role of Obama's de facto assassination czar, raising concerns even within the Obama administration that the White House is increasingly turning into ''a pseudo-military headquarters'' under the direction of just a few senior Obama administration officials.

Adding to these concerns are serious questions about Brennan's qualification for this role.

Even before the 2008 election, eyebrows were raised over Brennan's role in the Obama campaign. An employee of The Analysis Corporation, of which Brennan was CEO, had improperly accessed passport information for Hillary Clinton, Obama's Democratic primary challenger at the time, and GOP nominee John McCain. At the time, Brennan was a top adviser to the Obama campaign, and Brennan's employee was not fired. One of the key witnesses in the case was found murdered in his car outside his church while the investigation was still ongoing.

Brennan was involved in administration intrigue related to the release of convicted Libyan Pan Am Flight 103 bomber from a Scottish jail in August 2009. At the time of Megrahi's release, when he returned to Libya to a national hero's welcome, Brennan described the release as ''unfortunate, inappropriate, and wrong'' and called for his reimprisonment. However, Obama administration documents obtained by The Sunday Times revealed that the White House had secretly informed Scottish authorities that they found compassionate release more palatable than the reimprisonment of Megrahi in Libya.

Brennan also came under fire after would-be underwear bomber Umar Farouk—and I won't try that last name—nearly brought down a U.S.-bound Northwest Airlines flight on Christmas Day 2009. British intelligence authorities had notified their U.S. counterparts of an ''Umar Farouk'' meeting with al Qaeda cleric Anwar al Awlaki in Yemen, and Umar Farouk's father had warned of his son's increasing extremism to CIA officials at the U.S. Embassy in Nigeria. However, Umar Farouk was never added to the U.S. no-fly list, nor was his U.S. visa revoked.

□ 1340

And but for, as I understand it, him sweating too much around his posterior that helped defuse the bomb and then the work of some heroic passengers to stop him once he tried, the crew was—the passengers were saved. But it was certainly no thanks to the Obama administration or Mr. Brennan.

Now, back to the article. Patrick Poole says:

Following this stunning and nearly fatal intelligence failure which prompted members of both the House and Senate Intelligence oversight committees to call for his resignation, Brennan lashed out at the Obama administration's critics in a USA Today editorial. He claimed that the ''politically motivated criticism and unfounded fear-mongering only serve the goals of al Qaeda.''

Let me insert here, if he thinks, Mr. Brennan thinks that questioning failures of the Obama administration is contributing to al Qaeda, what must bombing innocent people with drones be doing for al Qaeda?

Back to the article. It says:

Brennan also defended treating Umar Farouk as a criminal by having his rights read to him upon arrest and trying him in civilian court, rather than transferring the would-be bomber to military custody as an enemy combatant.

Just days later, Brennan gave a speech to Islamic law students at New York University, where he was introduced by Ingrid Mattson, president of the Islamic Society of North America, at that time. Mattson, who had been involved with the Obama inaugural prayer service, had come under fire then for her organization's longstanding terrorist support.

During his New York University speech, Brennan defended the administration's highly unpopular move to try al Qaeda operations chief Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in Federal court, which the administration eventually backed away from. He claimed that terrorists are the real victims of ''political, economic and social forces.''

Mr. Speaker, it's important people understand. John Brennan claimed that the terrorists killing Americans, over 3,000 on 9/11, were the real victims of a political, economic, and social force.

Brennan said that Islamic terrorists are not jihadists, referenced ''Al-Quds'' instead of Jerusalem, and described the 20 percent of former Guantanamo detainees returning to terrorist activities as ''not that bad'' when compared to ordinary criminal recidivism.

The thousands of people that have likely been killed by the 20 percent of our detainees being returned to terrorist activities probably would not consider Mr. Brennan's assessment as not that bad. They wouldn't consider that all that accurate.

Patrick writes a great article. He has another one January 7, 2013, entitled, ''Revisiting 'Jihad' John Brennan.''

Another, by my friend, Andrew McCarthy, on February 4, opposed Brennan for CIA Director. I will include these articles in the RECORD.

It is time we took a real objective look at people who say their goal is civilization jihad and the elimination of our freedom to choose as we please and to choose our public servants.

[From the PJ Tatler, Jan. 7, 2013]

REVISITING ''JIHAD'' JOHN BRENNAN

(By Patrick Poole)

This afternoon at a White House ceremony, Obama announced that his nominee for CIA Director will be 'Jihad' John Brennan, his current counterterrorism adviser.

Back in June, I profiled Brennan here at PJ Media. Some of 'Jihad' John's recent highlights include:

March 2008: John McCain's passport information leaked from John Brennan's company during presidential campaign (key witness murdered during investigation)

April 2008: Brennan tells the New York Times that US government official must stop ''Iran-bashing''

Feb 2010: Brennan attacks critics of Obama Admin's handling of ''underwear bomber'' Abdulmutallab as a criminal, not a terrorist, saying that critics are ''serving the goals of Al-Qaeda''

May 2010: Brennan says he wants to build up ''Hezbollah moderates''

May 2010: Brennan defends 'Jihad' as a 'legitimate tenet of Islam'

June 2010: Washington Times editorial slams Brennan, saying, ''President Obama's top counterterrorism adviser knows very little about terrorism, and that's scary for America.''

Aug 2010: Brennan storms out of meeting with Washington Times editorial staff after he claims he was misquoted by newspaper and editor begins reading Brennan's own quotes back to him out loud

Sept 2010: Known HAMAS operative given escorted tour of National Counterterrorism Center

May 2012: Brennan implicated in major White House intelligence breach involving UK/Saudi Al-Qaeda infiltrator

Aug 2012: Brennan attacks critics of politically-driven White House intelligence leaks

Sept 2012: House Intel Committee Chairman Mike Rogers says changes in CIA's Benghazi attack talking points blaming Mohammed video happened under deputies committee chaired by Brennan

Again, these are just some of John Brennan's highlights. We could also add his laughable claims of no collateral casualties from his drone assassination program or his defense of trying Al-Qaeda operations chief Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in federal court or his role in the White House back-door dealing with the UK on the release of Libyan Pan Am Flight 103 bomber Abdelbaset al-Megrahi or his reference to Jerusalem as ''Al-Quds'' in a NYU speech or his claims that the 20 percent recidivism rate for GITMO detainees (those who returned to terrorism) was ''not that bad''. But that would be piling on.

What should be clear is that John Brennan's role in Barack Obama's disastrous first term should preclude him from any further service in the second term, let alone a promotion.

[From PJ Media, June 6, 2012]

MEET JOHN BRENNAN, OBAMA'S ASSASSINATION CZAR

(By Patrick Poole)

A relatively unnoticed article by Associated Press reporter Kimberly Dozier two weeks ago outlined new Obama administration policy changes which consolidated power for authorizing drone attacks and assassinations under political appointees within the White House.

The article identifies White House counterterrorism chief John Brennan as the official assuming the role of Obama's de facto assassination czar, raising concerns even within the Obama administration that the White House is increasingly turning into ''a pseudo-military headquarters'' under the direction of just a few senior Obama administration officials.

Adding to these concerns are serious questions about Brennan's qualifications for this role.

Even before the 2008 election, eyebrows were raised over Brennan's role in the Obama campaign. An employee of The Analysis Corporation, of which Brennan was CEO, had improperly accessed passport information for Hillary Clinton, Obama's Democratic primary challenger at the time, and GOP nominee John McCain. At the time, Brennan was a top adviser to the Obama campaign, and Brennan's employee was not fired. (One of the key witnesses in the case was found murdered in his car outside his church while the investigation was still ongoing.)

Brennan was involved in administration intrigue related to the release of convicted Libyan Pan Am Flight 103 bomber Abdelbaset al-Megrahi from a Scottish jail in August 2009. At the time of Megrahi's release—when he returned to Libya to a national hero's welcome—Brennan described the release as ''unfortunate, inappropriate,

and wrong'' and called for his reimprisonment. However, Obama administration documents obtained by The Sunday Times revealed that the White House had secretly informed Scottish authorities that they found compassionate release more palatable than the reimprisonment of Megrahi in Libya.

Brennan also came under fire after would-be underwear bomber Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab nearly brought down a U.S.-bound Northwest Airlines flight on Christmas Day 2009. British intelligence authorities had notified their U.S. counterparts of an ''Umar Farouk'' meeting with al-Qaeda cleric Anwar al-Awlaki in Yemen, and Abdulmutallab's father had warned of his son's increasing extremism to CIA officials at the U.S. embassy in Nigeria. However, Abdulmutallab was never added to the U.S. no-fly list, nor was his U.S. visa revoked.

Following this stunning and nearly fatal intelligence failure which prompted members of both the House and Senate Intelligence oversight committees to call for his resignation, Brennan lashed out at the Obama administration's critics in a USA Today editorial. He claimed that the ''politically motivated criticism and unfounded fear-mongering only serve the goals of al-Qaeda.''

Brennan also defended treating Abdulmutallab as a criminal by having his rights read to him upon arrest and trying him in civilian court, rather than transferring the would-be bomber to military custody as an enemy combatant.

Just days later, Brennan gave a speech to Islamic law students at New York University, where he was introduced by Ingrid Mattson, president of the Islamic Society of North America. Mattson, who had been involved with the Obama inaugural prayer service, had come under fire then for her organization's longstanding terrorist support.

During his NYU speech, Brennan defended the administration's highly unpopular move to try al-Qaeda operations chief Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in federal court (which the administration eventually backed away from). He claimed that terrorists are the real victims of ''political, economic and social forces,'' said that Islamic terrorists were not jihadists, referenced ''Al-Quds'' instead of Jerusalem, and described the 20 percent of former Guantanamo detainees returning to terrorist activities as ''not that bad'' when compared to ordinary criminal recidivism.

During a talk at the Nixon Center in May 2010, Brennan said that the administration was looking for ways to build up ''moderate elements'' of the Lebanese terrorist organization Hezbollah. Two weeks later, at a speech at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Brennan defended the Islamic doctrines of jihad as ''a holy struggle'' and ''a legitimate tenet of Islam.''

These missteps and misstatements by Brennan prompted the Washington Times to editorialize in June 2010 that ''President Obama's top counterterrorism adviser knows very little about terrorism, and that's scary for America,'' and to warn that ''Mr. Brennan's curious views may be part of a larger move by the O Force to redefine terrorism''.

Rep. Peter King, then-House Homeland Security Committee ranking member (now committee chairman), called for Brennan's firing, saying:

Here's the problem . . . and this is from people from the intelligence community too. John Brennan is running intelligence policy from the White House. He is getting in the weeds in different intelligence organizations that are out there. He's doing this from the White House. Obviously, he is not subject to Congressional scrutiny, because he's on the White House staff, and it's a very dangerous situation, where you have a homeland security advisor who is beyond the reach of Congress actually making, running, and carrying on intelligence policy. It's wrong. I'm not aware of it happening before.

Stung by these criticisms, Brennan demanded to meet with the editorial staff of the Washington Times. During the June 2010 meeting, Brennan claimed that the newspaper had misrepresented his views, even as the editors read his statements directly from his speeches posted on the White House website.

When Brennan was cornered by senior editorial writer Jim Robbins about his views on jihad being a legitimate tenet of Islam, Brennan abruptly ended the interview and stormed out of their offices.

In September 2010, after I broke the story that a known top U.S. Hamas official had been given a guided tour of the top-secret National Counterterrorism Center and FBI Academy at Quantico under Brennan's watch, several former top intelligence and defense officials again called for his resignation.

Last month, it was revealed that Brennan was implicated in a serious intelligence breach detailing an ongoing counterterrorism operation led by British and Saudi intelligence agencies that had placed an operative deep inside the al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) organization. The White House leak forced the termination of the operation and the immediate withdrawal of the double agent, infuriating our foreign intelligence allies.

Just two weeks ago, internal White House documents obtained by Judicial Watch through a FOIA request revealed that Brennan and other White House officials had met twice with Hollywood filmmakers preparing a movie about the killing of Osama bin Laden, providing them unparalleled access including the identity of a SEAL Team 6 operator and commander along with other classified information. Amazingly, these high-level White House meetings between * * *

[From Ordered Liberty, Feb. 4, 2013]

OPPOSE BRENNAN FOR CIA DIRECTOR

(By Andrew C. McCarthy)

To cut to the chase, a country that was serious about its national security would never put John Brennan in charge of its premier intelligence service.

Of course, it is by no means clear that the United States is any longer a serious country in this regard. Serious countries do not fund, arm and ''partner with'' hostile regimes. They do not recruit enemy sympathizers to fill key governmental policy positions. They do not erect barriers impeding their intelligence services from understanding an enemy's threat doctrine—in conscious indifference to Sun Tzu's maxim that defending oneself requires knowing one's enemies. All of these malfeasances have become staples of Obama policy, under the guidance of Brennan, the president's counterterrorism guru.

Still, the installation of a Beltway operator whose métier is misinformation as director of central intelligence would be an epic mismatch of man and mission. It would expand unseriousness to new frontiers of self-inflicted peril.

The reason is as elementary as it gets: The purpose of intelligence is to see what your enemy is trying to hide, to grasp how your enemy thinks, and how he cleverly camouflages what he thinks. That, to be certain, is the only security against stealthy foes who specialize in sabotage, in exploiting the liberties that make free societies as vulnerable as they are worth defending.

Mr. Brennan, to the contrary, is the incarnation of willful blindness. His tenure as Obama's top national security advisor has been about helping our enemies throw sand in our eyes and thus enabling the sabotage.

As I detail in The Grand Jihad, which recounts the Muslim Brotherhood's history, ideology, and self-proclaimed ''civilization jihad'' against the West, sabotage is the Brotherhood's defining practice. Indeed, ''sabotage'' is the word the Brothers themselves use to describe their work. It appears in an internal memorandum, which elaborates that the organization sees its mission in the United States as ''eliminating and destroying Western civilization from within.'' Besides that long-term goal, the Brotherhood's network of American affiliates have pursued the more immediate aim of materially supporting Hamas, a formally designated terrorist organization to which the provision of material support is a felony under federal law.

None of that is new. It was not merely well known but had been proved in court by the Justice Department a year before Obama took office. I refer to the Justice Department's 2008 Hamas financing prosecution, the Holy Land Foundation case. Yet, counterterrorism czar Brennan remains undeterred, a driving force of the Obama administration's ''Islamic outreach''—a campaign to give Islamist organizations influence over U.S. policy. That several of those organizations were proved in the HLF case to be members of the Muslim Brotherhood's American network is clearly of no moment.

Two such organizations are the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) and the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA). They were among a slew of Islamist groups who wrote to Brennan in October 2011 to demand a purge of information about Islamist ideology that was being used to train U.S. intelligence and law-enforcement agents. Much of that information was developed in federal investigations that have led to the convictions of violent jihadists. Nevertheless, the Obama administration has slavishly complied (see, e.g., here and here).

Understand: CAIR and ISNA, though never indicted, were proved to be conspirators in the Brotherhood's Holy Land Foundation scheme to promote and finance Hamas. In fact, the FBI formally cut ties with CAIR as a result of the HLF case (although why they had ties with CAIR in the first place remains baffling). The training materials the Islamist groups insisted be removed include documentation of the fact that terrorism committed by Muslims is driven by an ideology rooted in Islamic scripture.

That this irrefutable fact makes us uncomfortable renders it no less a fact. Maybe the State Department and the White House press office have the luxury of trading in convenient fictions in order to reduce international tensions. Not intelligence agencies. The point of intelligence—a bedrock of national security—is to see the world as it is, not as we wish it to be.

Here is how it is: Islamic supremacism, the sharia-based ideology of Islamists, is an interpretation of Muslim doctrine that is entirely mainstream among the world's Muslims. That is why Islamists are winning elections in the Middle East even as they are found aligning with violent jihadists. Islamic supremacism is, in fact, widely promoted by the Brotherhood, and by such tentacles of its American network as CAIR and ISNA, when they are not otherwise deceptively disavowing its existence.

This Islamist ideology is incorrigibly anti-Western and anti-Semitic. It is deeply hostile to principles of equality and individual liberty (free speech, freedom of conscience, privacy, economic freedom, etc.) that undergird our Constitution, the American conception of civil rights, and the West's conception of human rights. Understand Islamist

ideology and you will readily understand the ferocity of Islamic resistance to American efforts to promote democracy in the Middle East—not merely jihadist resistance but broad Islamic resistance.

Yet, in a propaganda campaign reminiscent of those waged by the Nazis and the Soviets, Islamists and their fellow travelers (Brennan-types who might be thought of as ''ant-ianti-Islamists'') purport to be champions of human rights. When it suits them, they even feign reverence for individual liberties (particularly when it comes to the rights of Muslim in America . . . but don't you dare ask them how non-Muslims fare in, say, Saudi Arabia).

The counter to such a propaganda campaign is a job for intelligence agencies. The point of having a sprawling intelligence community on which American taxpayers annually lavish $55 billion—far more than the vast majority of countries spend on national defense—is precisely to see through the deceptions of those who mean us harm, to perceive the threats against us for what they are. That the competent performance of this essential function may be fraught with political complications is supposed to be a challenge for our politicians, not our intelligence agents. The latter's mission of unearthing hidden and often excruciating truths is hard enough.

Brennan's agenda is the antithesis of the intelligence mission. His goal has been to portray our enemies as a small, unthreatening fringe of charlatan ''violent extremists,'' who kill wantonly and are unconnected to any ''legitimate'' Islam. Thus, he maintains for example that the only ''legitimate'' interpretation of the ''tenet of Islam'' known as jihad is: a ''holy struggle . . . to purify oneself or one's community.''

Even taken at face value, Brennan's assertion is absurd. There is between Islam and the West no common understanding of the good, and thus no consensus about ''purity.'' In Islam, to ''purify'' something means to make it more compliant with sharia, Islam's legal code and societal framework. Sharia is anti-freedom and anti-equality, so to purify oneself in an Islamic sense would necessarily mean something very different from what we in the West would think of as struggling to become a better person.

But there is an even more fundamental reason not to take Brennan's remarks at face value: they run afoul of what mainstream Islam itself says about jihad. Have a look at Reliance of the Traveller, the popular sharia manual (it is available on Amazon). It is quite straightforward on the matter: ''Jihad means to war against non-Muslims.'' Reliance, you should know, has been expressly endorsed by al-Azhar University in Egypt (Islam's center of learning since the tenth century) and the International Institute of Islamic Thought (the Brotherhood's America-based Islamist think-tank). It is a lot more authoritative than John Brennan's wishful meanderings. Maybe the president actually thinks Brennan knows more about Islam than do these scholars who have spent their lives steeped in Islamic doctrine and jurisprudence. I have my doubts . . . and, judging from the profound influence of these scholars, so do many millions of Muslims.

In Brennan's world we're to believe that holy war is not much different from the struggle to remember to brush after every meal. In Brennan's world, there is also no need to fret over * * *

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 643(c) of The American Taxpayer Relief Act (P.L. 112–240), I am pleased to appoint the following individuals to the Commission on Long-Term Care.

Bruce Allen Chernof, Los Angeles, CA
Judith Stein, Storrs, CT
George Vradenburg, Washington, DC

Thank you for your attention to these appointments.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic Leader.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

Mr. CRAWFORD (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a family emergency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, February 8, 2013, at 11 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> 'I, AB, do solemnly swear (or Affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.'

Has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

1 Jo Bonner
2 Martha Roby
3 Mike Rogers
4 Robert B. Aderholt
5 Mo Brooks
6 Spencer Bachus
7 Terri A. Sewell

ALASKA

At Large, Don Young

ARIZONA

1 Ann Kirkpatrick
2 Ron Barber
3 Raúl M. Grijalva
4 Paul A. Gosar
5 Matt Salmon
6 David Schweikert
7 Ed Pastor
8 Trent Franks
9 Kyrsten Sinema

ARKANSAS

1 Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford
2 Tim Griffin
3 Steve Womack
4 Tom Cotton

CALIFORNIA

1 Doug LaMalfa
2 Jared Huffman
3 John Garamendi
4 Tom McClintock
5 Mike Thompson
6 Doris O. Matsui
7 Ami Bera
8 Paul Cook
9 Jerry McNerney
10 Jeff Denham
11 George Miller
12 Nancy Pelosi
13 Barbara Lee
14 Jackie Speier
15 Eric Swalwell
16 Jim Costa
17 Michael M. Honda
18 Anna G. Eshoo
19 Zoe Lofgren
20 Sam Farr
21 David G. Valadao
22 Devin Nunes
23 Kevin McCarthy
24 Lois Capps
25 Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon
26 Julia Brownley
27 Judy Chu
28 Adam B. Schiff
29 Tony Cárdenas
30 Brad Sherman
31 Gary G. Miller
32 Grace F. Napolitano
33 Henry A. Waxman
34 Xavier Becerra
35 Gloria Negrete McLeod
36 Raul Ruiz
37 Karen Bass
38 Linda T. Sánchez
39 Edward R. Royce
40 Lucille Roybal-Allard
41 Mark Takano
42 Ken Calvert
43 Maxine Waters
44 Janice Hahn
45 John Campbell
46 Loretta Sanchez
47 Alan S. Lowenthal
48 Dana Rohrabacher
49 Darrell E. Issa
50 Duncan Hunter
51 Juan Vargas
52 Scott H. Peters
53 Susan A. Davis

COLORADO

1 Diana DeGette
2 Jared Polis
3 Scott R. Tipton
4 Cory Gardner
5 Doug Lamborn
6 Mike Coffman
7 Ed Perlmutter

CONNECTICUT

1 John B. Larson
2 Joe Courtney
3 Rosa L. DeLauro
4 James A. Himes
5 Elizabeth H. Esty

DELAWARE

At Large, John C. Carney, Jr.

FLORIDA

1 Jeff Miller
2 Steve Southerland II
3 Ted S. Yoho
4 Ander Crenshaw
5 Corrine Brown
6 Ron DeSantis
7 John L. Mica
8 Bill Posey
9 Alan Grayson
10 Daniel Webster
11 Richard B. Nugent
12 Gus M. Bilirakis
13 C.W. Bill Young
14 Kathy Castor
15 Dennis A. Ross
16 Vern Buchanan
17 Thomas J. Rooney
18 Patrick Murphy
19 Trey Radel
20 Alcee L. Hastings
21 Theodore E. Deutch
22 Lois Frankel
23 Debbie Wasserman Schultz
24 Frederica S. Wilson
25 Mario Diaz-Balart
26 Joe Garcia
27 Ileana Ros-Lehtinen

GEORGIA

1 Jack Kingston
2 Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
3 Lynn A. Westmoreland
4 Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr.
5 John Lewis
6 Tom Price
7 Rob Woodall
8 Austin Scott
9 Doug Collins
10 Paul C. Broun
11 Phil Gingrey
12 John Barrow
13 David Scott
14 Tom Graves

HAWAII

1 Colleen W. Hanabusa
2 Tulsi Gabbard

IDAHO

1 Raúl R. Labrador
2 Michael K. Simpson

ILLINOIS

1 Bobby L. Rush
2 [Vacant]
3 Daniel Lipinski
4 Luis V. Gutierrez
5 Mike Quigley
6 Peter J. Roskam
7 Danny K. Davis
8 Tammy Duckworth
9 Janice D. Schakowsky
10 Bradley S. Schneider
11 Bill Foster
12 William L. Enyart
13 Rodney Davis
14 Randy Hultgren
15 John Shimkus
16 Adam Kinzinger
17 Cheri Bustos
18 Aaron Schock

INDIANA

1 Peter J. Visclosky
2 Jackie Walorski
3 Marlin A. Stutzman
4 Todd Rokita
5 Susan W. Brooks
6 Luke Messer
7 André Carson
8 Larry Bucshon
9 Todd C. Young

IOWA

1 Bruce L. Braley
2 David Loebsack
3 Tom Latham
4 Steve King

KANSAS

1 Tim Huelskamp
2 Lynn Jenkins
3 Kevin Yoder
4 Mike Pompeo

KENTUCKY

1 Ed Whitfield
2 Brett Guthrie
3 John A. Yarmuth
4 Thomas Massie
5 Harold Rogers
6 Garland ''Andy'' Barr

LOUISIANA

1 Steve Scalise
2 Cedric L. Richmond
3 Charles W. Boustany, Jr.
4 John Fleming
5 Rodney Alexander
6 Bill Cassidy

MAINE

1 Chellie Pingree
2 Michael H. Michaud

MARYLAND

1 Andy Harris
2 C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger
3 John P. Sarbanes
4 Donna F. Edwards
5 Steny H. Hoyer
6 John K. Delaney
7 Elijah E. Cummings
8 Chris Van Hollen

MASSACHUSETTS

1 Richard E. Neal
2 James P. McGovern
3 Niki Tsongas
4 Joseph P. Kennedy III
5 Edward J. Markey
6 John F. Tierney
7 Michael E. Capuano
8 Stephen F. Lynch
9 William R. Keating

MICHIGAN

1 Dan Benishek
2 Bill Huizenga
3 Justin Amash
4 Dave Camp
5 Daniel T. Kildee
6 Fred Upton
7 Tim Walberg
8 Mike Rogers
9 Sander M. Levin
10 Candice S. Miller
11 Kerry L. Bentivolio
12 John D. Dingell
13 John Conyers, Jr.
14 Gary C. Peters

MINNESOTA

1 Timothy J. Walz
2 John Kline
3 Erik Paulsen
4 Betty McCollum
5 Keith Ellison
6 Michele Bachmann
7 Collin C. Peterson
8 Richard M. Nolan

MISSISSIPPI

1 Alan Nunnelee
2 Bennie G. Thompson
3 Gregg Harper
4 Steven M. Palazzo

MISSOURI

1 Wm. Lacy Clay
2 Ann Wagner
3 Blaine Luetkemeyer
4 Vicky Hartzler
5 Emanuel Cleaver
6 Sam Graves
7 Billy Long
8 Jo Ann Emerson

MONTANA

At Large, Steve Daines

NEBRASKA

1 Jeff Fortenberry
2 Lee Terry
3 Adrian Smith

NEVADA

1 Dina Titus
2 Mark E. Amodei
3 Joseph J. Heck
4 Steven A. Horsford

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1 Carol Shea-Porter
2 Ann M. Kuster

NEW JERSEY

1 Robert E. Andrews
2 Frank A. LoBiondo
3 Jon Runyan
4 Christopher H. Smith
5 Scott Garrett
6 Frank Pallone, Jr.
7 Leonard Lance
8 Albio Sires
9 Bill Pascrell, Jr.
10 Donald M. Payne, Jr.
11 Rodney P. Frelinghuysen
12 Rush Holt

NEW MEXICO

1 Michelle Lujan Grisham
2 Stevan Pearce
3 Ben Ray Luján

NEW YORK

1 Timothy H. Bishop
2 Peter T. King
3 Steve Israel
4 Carolyn McCarthy
5 Gregory W. Meeks
6 Grace Meng
7 Nydia M. Velázquez
8 Hakeem S. Jeffries
9 Yvette D. Clarke
10 Jerrold Nadler
11 Michael G. Grimm
12 Carolyn B. Maloney
13 Charles B. Rangel
14 Joseph Crowley
15 José E. Serrano
16 Eliot L. Engel
17 Nita M. Lowey
18 Sean Patrick Maloney
19 Christopher P. Gibson
20 Paul Tonko
21 William L. Owens
22 Richard L. Hanna
23 Tom Reed
24 Daniel B. Maffei
25 Louise McIntosh Slaughter
26 Brian Higgins
27 Chris Collins

NORTH CAROLINA

1 G. K. Butterfield
2 Renee L. Ellmers
3 Walter B. Jones
4 David E. Price
5 Virginia Foxx
6 Howard Coble
7 Mike McIntyre
8 Richard Hudson
9 Robert Pittenger
10 Patrick T. McHenry
11 Mark Meadows
12 Melvin L. Watt
13 George Holding

NORTH DAKOTA

At Large, Kevin Cramer

OHIO

1 Steve Chabot
2 Brad R. Wenstrup
3 Joyce Beatty

4 Jim Jordan
5 Robert E. Latta
6 Bill Johnson
7 Bob Gibbs
8 John A. Boehner
9 Marcy Kaptur
10 Michael R. Turner
11 Marcia L. Fudge
12 Patrick J. Tiberi
13 Tim Ryan
14 David P. Joyce
15 Steve Stivers
16 James B. Renacci

OKLAHOMA

1 Jim Bridenstine
2 Markwayne Mullin
3 Frank D. Lucas
4 Tom Cole
5 James Lankford

OREGON

1 Suzanne Bonamici
2 Greg Walden
3 Earl Blumenauer
4 Peter A. DeFazio
5 Kurt Schrader

PENNSYLVANIA

1 Robert A. Brady
2 Chaka Fattah
3 Mike Kelly
4 Scott Perry
5 Glenn Thompson
6 Jim Gerlach
7 Patrick Meehan
8 Michael G. Fitzpatrick
9 Bill Shuster
10 Tom Marino
11 Lou Barletta
12 Keith J. Rothfus
13 Allyson Y. Schwartz
14 Michael F. Doyle
15 Charles W. Dent
16 Joseph R. Pitts
17 Matt Cartwright
18 Tim Murphy

RHODE ISLAND

1 David N. Cicilline
2 James R. Langevin

SOUTH CAROLINA

1 [VACANT]
2 Joe Wilson
3 Jeff Duncan
4 Trey Gowdy
5 Mick Mulvaney
6 James E. Clyburn
7 Tom Rice

SOUTH DAKOTA

At Large, Kristi L. Noem

TENNESSEE

1 David P. Roe
2 John J. Duncan, Jr.
3 Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann
4 Scott DesJarlais
5 Jim Cooper
6 Diane Black
7 Marsha Blackburn
8 Stephen Lee Fincher
9 Steve Cohen

TEXAS

1 Louie Gohmert
2 Ted Poe
3 Sam Johnson Plano
4 Ralph M. Hall
5 Jeb Hensarling
6 Joe Barton
7 John Abney Culberson
8 Kevin Brady
9 Al Green
10 Michael T. McCaul
11 K. Michael Conaway
12 Kay Granger
13 Mac Thornberry
14 Randy K. Weber, Sr.
15 Rubén Hinojosa
16 Beto O'Rourke
17 Bill Flores
18 Sheila Jackson Lee
19 Randy Neugebauer
20 Joaquin Castro
21 Lamar Smith
22 Pete Olson
23 Pete P. Gallego
24 Kenny Marchant
25 Roger Williams
26 Michael C. Burgess
27 Blake Farenthold
28 Henry Cuellar
29 Gene Green
30 Eddie Bernice Johnson
31 John R. Carter
32 Pete Sessions
33 Marc A. Veasey
34 Filemon Vela
35 Lloyd Doggett
36 Steve Stockman

UTAH

1 Rob Bishop
2 Chris Stewart
3 Jason Chaffetz
4 Jim Matheson

VERMONT

At Large, Peter Welch

VIRGINIA

1 Robert J. Wittman
2 E. Scott Rigell
3 Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott
4 J. Randy Forbes
5 Robert Hurt
6 Bob Goodlatte
7 Eric Cantor
8 James P. Moran
9 H. Morgan Griffith
10 Frank R. Wolf
11 Gerald E. Connolly

WASHINGTON

1 Suzan K. DelBene
2 Rick Larsen
3 Jaime Herrera Beutler
4 Doc Hastings
5 Cathy McMorris Rodgers
6 Derek Kilmer
7 Jim McDermott
8 David G. Reichert
9 Adam Smith
10 Denny Heck

WEST VIRGINIA

1 David B. McKinley
2 Shelley Moore Capito
3 Nick J. Rahall II

WISCONSIN

1 Paul Ryan
2 Mark Pocan
3 Ron Kind
4 Gwen Moore
5 F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.
6 Thomas E. Petri
7 Sean P. Duffy
8 Reid J. Ribble

WYOMING

At Large, Cynthia M. Lummis

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner, Pedro R. Pierluisi

AMERICAN SAMOA

Delegate, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton

GUAM

Delegate, Madeleine Z. Bordallo

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Delegate, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Delegate, Donna M. Christensen

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Robert B. Aderholt, Rodney Alexander, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Ron Barber, Lou Barletta, Garland ''Andy'' Barr, John Barrow, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Kerry L. Bentivolio, Ami Bera, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Jo Bonner, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cárdenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Tom Cotton, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Steve Daines, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, William L. Enyart, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Pete P. Gallego, John Garamendi, Joe Garcia, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Rush Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steven A. Horsford, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen,

John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Daniel B. Maffei, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Thomas Massie, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Gloria Negrete McLeod, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Gary C. Peters, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Trey Radel, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Bradley S. Schneider, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland II, Jackie Speier, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Steve Stockman, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takano, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Jackie Walorski, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, C. W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

217. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2012-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8263] received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

218. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No.: FEMA-2012-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8265] received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

219. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Adequacy of Massachusetts Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Permit Program [EPA-R01-RCRA-2012-0944; FRL-9771-7] received January 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

220. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio and Indiana; Cincinnati-Hamilton, Ohio; Ohio and Indiana 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revisions to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0648; EPA-R05-2012-0834; FRL-9773-5] received January 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

221. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Decommissioning Planning During Operations [Regulatory Guide 4.22] received January 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

222. A letter from the Administrator, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Termination of the Southern Sea Otter Translocation Program [FWS-R8-FHC-2011-0046]; [FF09E32000-134-FXES11130900000] (RIN: 1018-AX51) received January 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

223. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — 2013-2014 Summer Flounder and Scup Specifications; 2013 Black Sea Bass Specifications; Preliminary 2013 Quota Adjustments; 2013 Summer Flounder Quota for Delaware [Docket No.: 121009528-2729-02] (RIN: 0648-XC287) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

224. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2013 Commercial and Recreational Quotas for Red Snapper [Docket No.: 120213124-1066-02] (RIN: 0648-XC388) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

225. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2013-2014 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures [Docket No.: 120814338-2711-02] (RN: 0648-BC35) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

226. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 120201086-2418-02] (RIN: 0648-XC394) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

227. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska Management Area [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XC415) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

228. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2013 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pollock, Atka Mackerel, and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XC423) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

229. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 111220786-1781-01] (RIN: 0648-XC396) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

230. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2013 Gulf of Alaska Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XC422) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

231. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 100804324-1265-02] (RIN: 0648-BC61) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

232. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Internet Publication of Administrative Seizure and Forfeiture Notices [Docket No.: USCBP-2011-0022] [CBP Dec. 13-04] (RIN: 1651-AA94) received January 24, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

233. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Regulations Relating to Information Reporting by Foreign Financial Institutions and Withholding on Certain Payments to Foreign Financial Institutions and Other Foreign Entities [TD 9610] (RIN: 1545-BK68) received January 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

234. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Health Insurance Premium Tax Credit [TD 9611] (RIN: 1545-BL49) received January 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

235. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Information Reporting by Domestic Entities under Section 6038D with Respect to Specified Foreign Financial Assets [Notice 2013-10] received January 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

236. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualified Zone Academy Bond Allocations for 2012 and 2013 [Notice 2013-03] received January 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 521. A bill to award grants to encourage State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to utilize technology to improve student achievement and college-and-career readiness, the skills of teachers and school leaders, and the efficiency and productivity of education systems at all levels; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 522. A bill to reduce a portion of the annual pay of Members of Congress for the failure to adopt a concurrent resolution on the budget which does not provide for a balanced budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DENT, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MICA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RADEL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. AMASH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 524. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency does not have the authority to disapprove a permit after it has been issued by the Secretary of the Army under section 404 of such Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AMASH, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 525. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MORAN, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. CHU, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 526. A bill to place a moratorium on permitting for mountaintop removal coal mining until health studies are conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 527. A bill to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 528. A bill to prohibit foreign assistance to countries with a gross domestic product of $1,500,000,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain individuals a credit against income tax for contributions to 529 plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 530. A bill to establish the Independent Government Waste Reduction Board; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 531. A bill to prevent identity theft and tax crimes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CHU,

Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 532. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to modify the dischargeability of debts for certain educational payments and loans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 533. A bill to provide authorities for the appropriate conversion of temporary seasonal wildland firefighters and other temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies who perform regularly recurring seasonal work to permanent seasonal positions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 534. A bill to establish the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to facilitate the fullest cooperation and coordination between all levels of government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Build America Bonds program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 536. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants for recruiting, training, and retaining individuals, with a preference for individuals from underrepresented groups, as teachers at public elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 537. A bill to prohibit employers and certain other entities from requiring or requesting that employees and certain other individuals provide a user name, password, or other means for accessing a personal account on any social networking website; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 538. A bill to protect the Nation's law enforcement officers by banning the FiveseveN Pistol and 5.7 x 28mm SS190, SS192, SS195LF, SS196, and SS197 cartridges, testing handguns and ammunition for capability to penetrate body armor, and prohibiting the manufacture, importation, sale, or purchase of such handguns or ammunition by civilians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 539. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize a bipartisan majority of Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission to hold nonpublic collaborative discussions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. GARDNER):

H.R. 540. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 541. A bill to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 542. A bill to limit restrictions on deer hunting within the Kisatchie National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HOLT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 543. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HALL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 544. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to change the permissible age variation in health insurance premium rates; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 545. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to create an adjustment to the discretionary spending limits for appropriations for emergency job creation; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 546. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to prepare individuals with multiple barriers to employment to enter the workforce by providing such individuals with support services, job training, and education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 547. A bill to provide for the establishment of a border protection strategy for the international land borders of the United States, to address the ecological and environmental impacts of border security infrastructure, measures, and activities along the international land borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 548. A bill to restore growth, spur job creation, build momentum toward economic recovery for border communities and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Small Business, Oversight and Government Reform, Foreign Affairs, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the creation of policyholder disaster protection funds, Catastrophe Savings Accounts, and tax credits for natural disaster mitigation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 550. A bill to amend the renewable fuel program under section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act to require the cellulosic biofuel requirement to be based on actual production; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 551. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support early college high schools and other dual enrollment programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. VELA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 552. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that the South Texas Veterans Affairs Health Care Center in Harlingen, Texas, includes a full-service Department of Veterans Affairs inpatient health care facility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 553. A bill to designate the exclusive economic zone of the United States as the ''Ronald Wilson Reagan Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 554. A bill to provide relief to homeowners affected by Superstorm Sandy who have mortgages insured by the FHA, or owned or guaranteed by Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 555. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct onshore oil and gas lease sales through Internet-based live lease sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 556. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require individuals to include their social security numbers on the income tax return as a condition of claiming the refundable portion of the child tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LONG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COLE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 557. A bill to prevent certain individuals purportedly appointed to the National Labor Relations Board from receiving salaries, and to prevent an unconstitutional quorum of the Board from taking agency actions, until there is a final decision in pending lawsuits regarding the constitutionality of certain alleged recess appointments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 558. A bill to provide Capitol-flown flags to the immediate family of fire fighters, law enforcement officers, emergency medical technicians, and other rescue workers who are killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 559. A bill to reduce by 5 percent the discretionary budget authority of any Federal agency for a fiscal year if the financial statement of the agency for the previous fiscal year does not receive a qualified or unqualified audit opinion by an external independent auditor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 560. A bill to establish the Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 561. A bill to amend the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to provide further clarity for institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 562. A bill to provide for a three-month extension of the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 563. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a grant program to fund additional school social workers and retain school social workers already employed in high-need local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 564. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend funding for family-to-family health information centers to help families of children with disabilities or special health care needs make informed choices about health care for their children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 565. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize and support the creation of cardiomyopathy education, awareness, and risk assessment materials and resources by the Secretary of Health and Human Services through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the dissemination of such materials and resources by State educational agencies to identify more at-risk families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 566. A bill to amend title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for a guarantee by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for qualified preretirement survivor annuities under insolvent or terminated multiemployer pension plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RADEL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 567. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to replace the Medicaid program and the Children's Health Insurance program with a block grant to the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 568. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 569. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2013, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 570. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for annual cost-of-living adjustments to be made automatically by law each year in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 571. A bill to suspend United States assistance to Brazil until such time as Brazil amends its laws to remove the prohibition on extradition of nationals of Brazil to other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 572. A bill to suspend the issuance of visas to nationals of Brazil until such time as Brazil amends its laws to remove the prohibition on extradition of nationals of Brazil to other countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JONES, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. FARR, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 573. A bill to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 574. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform Medicare payment for physicians' services by eliminating the sustainable growth rate system and providing incentives for the adoption of innovative payment and delivery models to improve quality and efficiency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 575. A bill to express the sense of the Congress that the United States should not adopt any treaty that poses a threat to national sovereignty or abridges any rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution, such as the right to keep and bear arms, and to withhold funding from the United Nations unless the President certifies that the United Nations has not taken action to restrict, attempt to restrict, or otherwise adversely infringe upon the rights of individuals in the United States to keep and bear arms, or abridge any of the other constitutionally protected rights of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 576. A bill to save endangered species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 577. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under which certain persons may be treated as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 578. A bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 579. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 580. A bill to enhance the energy security of United States allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain emergency medical devices from the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MICA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LONG, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 582. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the individual and employer health insurance mandates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VELA (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 583. A bill to enhance the safety of ports of entry in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 584. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require labeling of genetically engineered fish; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 585. A bill to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Anchorage, Alaska, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversion interest to the City; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 586. A bill to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 587. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Niblack and Bokan Mountain mining area road corridors in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 588. A bill to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 589. A bill to amend the National Organ Transplant Act to prevent the sale of bone marrow and umbilical cord blood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. HAHN, Ms. BASS, Mr. WELCH, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate the expenditure of funds for political activity by corporations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HALL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RADEL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN):

H. Res. 56. A resolution celebrating the life of President Ronald Wilson Reagan on the anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Res. 57. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that in order to continue aggressive growth in the Nation's telecommunications and technology industries, the United States Government should "Get Out of the Way and Stay Out of the Way"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Res. 58. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any comprehensive plan to reform our national energy policy must promote the expanded use of renewable and alternative energy sources; increase our domestic refining capacity; promote conservation and increased energy efficiency; expand research and development, including domestic exploration; and enhance consumer education; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HIMES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WATT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H. Res. 59. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Black HIV/AIDS Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H. Res. 60. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of February 4 through February 8, 2013, as "National School Counseling Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H. Res. 61. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should work with the Government of Haiti to address gender-based violence against women and children; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:

H.R. 590. A bill for the relief of Nery Antonio Velasquez-Roblero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:

H.R. 591. A bill for the relief of Edi Orlando Garcia Armas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 6 of the United States Constitution and the 27th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act is justified by the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution which, by granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states, also allows Congress to prevent the federal government from interfering with Americans' ability to grow and process industrial hemp. This act is also justified by the Ninth Amendment and the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which recognize that rights and powers are retained and reserved by the people and to the States.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 2.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 8 of Article I and Articles 4, 5 and 6 of the United States Constitution and Amendments X and XIV of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

Article IV, Section 3

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, specifically, clauses 1, 3, and 18. Article IV, section 3, clause 2.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, the General Welfare Clause.

The PREEMIE Reauthorization Act, to expand research, education and intervention activities related to preterm birth. This legislation will specifically help reduce preterm birth, prevent newborn death and disability caused by premature birth, and expand research into the causes of preterm birth. In addition, it will promote the development, availability, and uses of evidence-based standards of care for pregnant women. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation will reauthorize the legislation signed into law in December 2006.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which states ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 which states that the Congress has power ''to regulate Commerce with the foreign Nations, and among the several States . . .

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clauses 1,3, and 18 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clauses 12, 13, or 14, which grant Congress the power to regulate the Army, Navy, and Military respectively.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section III: ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the

Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .''

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress' power under Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KELLY:

H.R. 557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which reads:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 [the Spending Clause] of the United States Constitution states that 'The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay for Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.' This bill restores the proper balance of power between the federal and state governments as intended under the 10th Amendment to the Constitution by devolving the responsibility of providing health care assistance for low income citizens to the states. It reinforces the founding constitutional principle that state governments are properly situated with attending to their citizens' health, safety, and general welfare.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution, and Amendment II of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Aritcle I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section, 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, as the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the imposition of the burdensome mandate on hardworking American taxpayers is an action Congress may take under its power to tax, and that

this bill seeks to repeal sections of title 26 U.S.C., the Internal Revenue Code.

By Mr. VELA:

H.R. 583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excised, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:

H.R. 590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4

By Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:

H.R. 591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 24.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This resolution is enacted pursuant to the powers conferred by the United States Constitution upon Congress by

Article V, which provides that ''The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution . . . which shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States . . .''

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.J. Res. 25.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution:

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. POLIS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 12: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 24: Mr. WELCH, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARR, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. POSEY, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 25: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 35: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 45: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SALMON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 50: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 100: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 101: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 104: Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 129: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CHU, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 149: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 164: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 165: Mr. LATTA, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 226: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 227: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 229: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 241: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 261: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 276: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 278: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 280: Mr. POCAN and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 282: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 283: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 292: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 300: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 303: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 311: Mr. LONG, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 312: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 321: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 324: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 332: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 333: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LONG, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 334: Mr. LONG, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 335: Mr. ISSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 351: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 357: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 366: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 376: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 377: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 382: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 383: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 404: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 420: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 422: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARTON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 436: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 445: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 447: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 448: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 449: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 455: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 456: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 476: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 483: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. RADEL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. COLE, Mr. PERRY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 484: Mr. ISSA and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 485: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 492: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. COLE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 494: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 499: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 503: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 519: Mr. HIMES, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. MARKEY.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. MARKEY.

H. Res. 13: Mr. BENISHEK.

H. Res. 24: Mr. CAMP, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H. Res. 30: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. YODER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H. Res. 35: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 36: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. WALBERG.

H. Res. 46: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR KENNETH QUINN

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ambassador Kenneth Quinn for receiving the Distinguished Service Award from the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The Distinguished Service Award is the American Farm Bureau Federation's highest honor and is reserved for individuals who have dedicated their careers to the advancement of agriculture. The president of Iowa Farm Bureau, Craig Hill, nominated Ambassador Quinn to receive this esteemed national award.

Dr. Kenneth Quinn's career and achievements are truly ones for the history book. A native Iowan, Kenneth grew up in Dubuque where he obtained his Bachelor's Degree from Loras College. Ambassador Quinn's wide-ranging diplomatic career led to his ascension as one of the federal government's most decorated Foreign Service officers, a top U.S. expert on Indochina, President Ford's Vietnamese interpreter, and ultimately as United States Ambassador to the Kingdom of Cambodia from 1996–1999. Dr. Quinn is regarded as the first person to report on the 1974 Cambodian genocide and is the only civilian to receive an Army Air Medal in Vietnam combat operations. Ambassador Quinn is also among the prestigious recipients of the Secretary of State's Award for Heroism and is the only Foreign Service office to receive the American Foreign Service Association Rivkin and Herter Awards for intellectual courage on three occasions.

Following his 32 year career in the Foreign Service, Dr. Quinn began his role as President of the World Food Prize Foundation in 2000. Since assuming this leadership role, Kenneth has overseen tens of millions of dollars in fundraising and the successful distribution of the annual Nobel Prize Food and Agriculture award. His contribution to the legacy of Dr. Norman Borlaug and the World Food Prize Foundation has been nothing short of remarkable.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better recipient for Farm Bureau's Distinguished Service Award than Ambassador Quinn. The dedication Dr. Quinn has displayed to his state and country throughout his career continues to change our world for the better. Ambassador Quinn's efforts embody the Iowa sprit and I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him for this achievement, thanking him for his service, and wishing him continued success in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE LOCKPORT TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL BOYS BOWLING TEAM'S STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Lockport Township High School Boys Bowling Team on winning their first Illinois High School Association championship.

Although they were in 12th place earlier in the tournament and risked elimination, the Porters demonstrated toughness and determination to maintain a qualifying position. Their persistence eventually allowed them to overcome a 300 pin deficit.

The Porters averaged an impressive 214 points per game, with their leading scorer and individual state champion, Shane Matejcek, scoring 286 points in his fifth game to help keep his team in contention for the title. Shane would finish with a total of 2,924 pins, the second highest score in state history. The team entered the second day in 3rd place, but emerged victorious after an impressive display of teamwork on a 12 for 13 run of strikes.

This victory is a reminder of how preparation, practice, and perseverance produce solid results, even when facing difficult challenges. Today, I am pleased to call on all my colleagues to join me in congratulating the young men of Lockport Township High School on winning the IHSA championship. Great job, Porters!

NATIONAL PEDIATRIC RESEARCH NETWORK ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 225, the "National Pediatric Research Action Network Act of 2013." This legislation would authorize the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to establish an up to 20 national pediatric research consortia. Each consortium will be a collaborative effort involving a leading pediatric medical center and numerous supporting institutions, and each will focus on both basic and translational research as well as training for new researchers. Additionally, this Act seeks to bring much needed attention to pediatric rare diseases. The intent is to expand, enhance, and improve coordinated NIH pediatric research.

As the Founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus I have been a tireless advocate on behalf of our nation's children for decades and an avid supporter of children's health.

Improved coordination under the guidance of the NIH will only enhance the communication and collaborative efforts between leading regional pediatric medical center and supporting smaller community centers. This will enable researchers to develop and hone their research on rare pediatric diseases such as spinal muscular atrophy, in addition to serving as training centers for new cutting edge research in this field. Researchers like those who work for the Pediatric Research Center.

Located in Houston, TX, the Pediatric Center is the premier research center within the University of Texas Health Science Center. Researchers who work at the center are currently working diligently to identifying the causes of disorders that affect children. They are experts in their fields and working on a variety of issues. One of which is trying to identify genes that result in birth defects.

Across our nation, birth disabilities, developmental disorders, and prematurity are leading cause of death in children, affecting nearly 25% of both newborns and children. We must support efforts to improve research. According to the Texas Department of State Health Services as of 2009, over 19,000 Texas babies are born each year with one or more major structural malformations or chromosomal anomalies.

For every 10,000 live births, about six births are affected by neural tube defects; 11 babies are born with cleft lip, and 13 are born with Down syndrome. Approximately 28.9% of all babies born from 1999–2008 with birth defects have more than one major birth defect. Certain birth defects exhibit higher rates in some racial/ethnic groups than others.

Birth defects are also the leading cause of death among infants in Texas. From 1999–2008, 5.3% of all live born babies delivered with a birth defect died; most died before their first birthday (4.6%) and 29% of all deaths to live born babies before their first birthday occurred among babies with a birth defect.

In 2010, birth defects resulted in nearly 42,000 hospitalizations among infants in Texas, with total charges over $2.2 billion, based on hospital discharge data. The average length of stay was 6.2 days and the average cost was $53,000 per hospitalization. While the average cost per hospitalization is comparable to national data, due to the large population of Texas relative to other states, total cost of hospitalization for infants with birth defects is high.

Texas has unique concerns about some of the potential causes of birth defects such as those concerning environmental pollutants (hazardous waste sites, air pollution, drinking water contaminants), health disparities (income, ethnicity), and maternal factors (diabetes, obesity).

Effective collaboration with the NIH could result in finding cures and treatments to prevent these deaths. Treatments of diseases like Spinal Muscular Atrophy.

Spinal muscular atrophy (SMA) Types I, II, and III are a group of hereditary diseases that cause weakness and the destruction of voluntary muscles in the arms and legs of infants and children.

An estimated one in 40 people are carriers of SMA and if both parents are carriers, there's a 25 percent chance of their child having SMA.

Most babies born with SMA Type I, die before their 2nd birthday. It is the number 1 genetic killer of children under the age of 2 in the United States. As it stands, there is no cure for SMA; however, I hope the research that is generated as the result of this bill will lead to great strides in tackling this devastating illness.

As we consider this measure, let us reflect upon the thousands of children's lives that might be saved as a result of this bill.

STORY OF AVERY

Lives like that of baby Avery, who was born in Texas. Avery, at 5 months old was diagnosed with Type 1 SMA and her parents were given the grim prognosis that their precious child would only live for another 18 months. Sadly for Avery's time with us was brief. Just prior to her passing, her father Mike pledged that he would work to raise SMA awareness. Today we have an opportunity to help Mike achieve his promise and through research and the debate on the floor today draw further attention to SMA.

TRIBUTE TO COACH ANDREW TRENKEL AND THE MAINE SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL CONSTITUTION TEAM

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Coach Andrew Trenkel and the Maine South High School Constitution Team for their achievement in winning the Illinois State Title of ''We the People: the Citizen and the Constitution.'' This marks the twenty-first time that Maine South's Constitution Team has won this title. ''We the People: the Citizen and the Constitution,'' a program sponsored by the Center for Civic Education, aims to develop critical thinking, problem solving, and cooperative participation skills through educating students about the American Constitutional democracy. During the competition, students participate in replicated Congressional hearings, present arguments, and respond to complex questions on the United States Constitution.

The primary goal of ''We the People'' is to encourage civic proficiency and develop responsibility among the students of the United States. Clearly the 2012–2013 Maine South Team members have accepted this challenge and are working to become future leaders.

Congratulations to all of the members of the 2012–2013 Constitution team: Coach Andrew Trenkel, Mark Abtahi, Jane Acker, Hannah Beswick-Hale, Elizabeth Black, Anthony Borkowski, Matthew Brendza, Patrick Devereuz, Claire Dockery, Renee Hannan, Natalie Kirchhoff, Rebecca Klages, Kevin Kohler, Philip Kulas, Michael Martino, Maddie McGrady, Jenny Mocarski, John Moran, Emily Murphy, Gibson Odderstol, Augusta Paulik, Tim Prinz, Paige Sammarco, Michael Solberg, Pavel Tamas, Jack Touhy, Justin Tomczyk, Dragan Trivanovic, Ryan Walek, and Henrik Weber.

On behalf of the 9th Congressional district of Illinois, I congratulate you on your achievement, and wish you the best of luck in the national competition in April 2013.

HONORING MAYOR JOHN REDNOUR

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the dedicated community service of Du Quoin, Illinois Mayor John Rednour as he retires after 24 years as mayor.

John Rednour grew up in Cutler, Illinois and began working as an ironworker. He worked on projects throughout the State, from Southern Illinois, to the St. Louis area and Chicago. It was during this phase of his career that John founded Rednour Steel Erectors, a company with which he maintains a partnership to this day.

John moved with his family to Du Quoin in the early 1970s and, in the 1980s he began a successful banking career when he led a group of investors that assumed control of the Du Quoin State Bank. John continues to serve as chairman of the bank.

While John was raising a family and embarking on successful careers, he also showed an early interest in public service. He served six years as a Perry County Commissioner, from 1967 to 1973, and was elected to the Trico School District Board of Education while in his 20s. John was elected mayor of the City of Du Quoin in 1989 and will officiate at his last City Council meeting next Monday, February 11.

In his 24 years as Mayor, John Rednour has left an indelible mark on Southern Illinois. He has been able to lead as well as compromise and he is justifiably proud of the infrastructure improvements that have occurred during his tenure as mayor, most notably the Highway 51, Poplar Street overpass, an industrial park and water and sewer improvement projects. All of these infrastructure improvements were completed while maintaining balanced municipal budgets. In evaluating potential projects, John's simple criterion was always, ''Is it good for Du Quoin?''

John Rednour's community contributions were not limited to his successful business ventures and service as mayor. John also serves as Chairman of the Illinois State Police Merit Board and is a commissioner of the Perry County Housing Authority. He has been active in politics his entire adult life, having served as a member of the Democratic National Committee for nearly 40 years.

John and his wife, Wanda, have been married for over 60 years and are proud parents, grandparents and great grandparents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in an expression of appreciation to Mayor John Rednour in recognition of his years of service as a community leader and to wish him and his family the very best in the future.

HONORING MRS. HELEN AGNES WEAVER

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Helen Agnes Weaver, a constituent of my district, who celebrated her 101st birthday on August 1, 2012.

A native of Philadelphia, Mrs. Weaver is devoted to her community and family. She is the proud mother of two children, the grandmother of seven grandchildren, and the great-grandmother of twenty-three great grandchildren, and the great-great-grandmother of seventeen great-great-grandchildren.

I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues help me in honoring the significant occasion of Mrs. Weaver's 101st birthday. Mrs. Weaver is the epitome of a life-long Philadelphian and a model citizen. We can all learn something from her fortitude and her commitment to her city and family. She will remain an inspiration for many generations to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 34 On Agreeing to H. Res. 48. Had I been present, I would have voted, ''no.''

TRIBUTE TO CPSC EMPLOYEE BILL MOORE ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of my constituent William J. (Bill) Moore, Trial Attorney in the Office of the General Counsel at the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, and to congratulate him on his retirement after 36 years of service at the CPSC.

Bill was born in New Jersey and has lived in Maryland most of his life. He began his career at the CPSC in 1974 as a law clerk while studying at American University's Washington College of Law and became one of CPSC's treasured compliance attorneys.

Bill worked chiefly in the Office of Compliance and Administrative Litigation and, most recently, in the Division of Compliance within the Office of the General Counsel. Over the course of his long and distinguished career, he helped to negotiate numerous major product recalls in a variety of product categories, including durable infant goods, toys, furnaces, electrical appliances, and outdoor equipment. He also served as lead counsel in some of the Commission's most prominent corrective action litigations, including those on gas valves, worm probes, BB guns, and toasters.

As an attorney working at the Commission shortly after its inception, Bill was instrumental

in ensuring the enforcement of the newly-drafted safety regulations. When the agency banned refuse bins that were tipping over, pinning down, and killing children who were playing around them, Bill was part of the team that travelled the country, engaging in enforcement litigation to have the unstable bins removed from public use. He later worked with the Commission's Office of Compliance to lay the groundwork that led to the guidance to eliminate soft bedding in cribs and to have babies placed on their backs for safe sleep. Bill was also instrumental in drafting the certification requirements for bicycle helmet and cigarette lighter regulations. During his tenure, Bill negotiated over $16 million in civil penalty fines, the highest cumulative amount of civil penalty fines in the agency's history.

Bill has played a major role in protecting the public from unreasonable risks of injury posed by consumer products. He has provided guidance to other attorneys and compliance staff as they pursue legal strategies against manufacturers, importers, distributors, and retailers of dangerously defective and hazardous products. Over the years, he received many well-deserved distinguished and meritorious awards for his outstanding work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Bill Moore and in extending our nation's gratitude to him for his honorable and productive service.

HONORING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF DOROTHY ROCKAITIS

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Dorothy Rockaitis, a lifelong resident of Chicago who is celebrating her 90th birthday today.

Dorothy Victoria Cichoszewski was born on February 6th, 1923, and was raised in Brighton Park by her parents, Victoria and Michael. She would later move to Garfield Ridge, where she lived for 50 years. In 1963, Dorothy married Frank Rockaitis, her steadfast partner for nearly four decades.

For over forty years, Dorothy was actively involved in government and politics. Not only did she work for Chicago Aldermen Frank Kuta and Bill Krstyniak, she also worked for Illinois State House member Robert Terzich. She later served Illinois' 3rd Congressional District on the staff of Congressman Bill Lipinski. As an office manager, secretary, and Democratic Precinct Captain, Dorothy faithfully served her party, city, and country for nearly half a century.

A vibrant and lively aunt, mother, grandmother, and great grandmother, Dorothy is beloved by so many around her. From her seventeen-year marriage with Frank Miller, Dorothy has three children: Michalene, Patricia, and Charles. Dorothy also has five grandchildren: Gina Glaubke, John Glaubke, Aaron Conrad, Keith Conrad, and Alicia Miller. From her grandchildren come four great grandchildren: Luca Conrad, Odette Conrad, Clare Glaubke, and Emma Glaubke.

Dorothy is a caring, energetic, and dedicated American who is deserving of our recognition and praise. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Dorothy Rockaitis a very happy 90th birthday, and to thank her for being such an active contributor to her community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF HATTIE ELIE JACKSON

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and contributions of Mrs. Hattie Elie Jackson, a Memphis educator, a devout woman of faith and a leader in the Civil Rights Movement. An Arkansas native, Mrs. Jackson graduated from Arkansas AM&N College, and obtained her master's degree at Columbia University in New York. She received further graduate-level education at the University of Chicago, and finally obtained her Education Specialist degree from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

Mrs. Jackson used her extensive education and many talents to serve and nurture the Memphis community. For 25 years she presided as principal over Double Tree Elementary School, inspiring young hearts, and helping to shape the minds of local luminaries such as former Memphis Congressman, Harold Ford, Jr. She was a devoted member of St. Andrew AME church, and played an active and energetic role in her faith community. She was the former first lady of St. Andrew AME Church, where she served as a trustee, Sunday school teacher and President of the Ruth Circle Club.

Mrs. Jackson was a leader in the Civil Rights Movement and in the Memphis Sanitation Strike of 1968. In 2004, she was inspired to write and publish an account of her personal recollection of the Sanitation Strike, entitled 65 Dark Days in '68. Her primary purpose in recording her memories, thoughts and feelings was to educate younger and future generations as to what transpired in 1968, and to inspire them to continue to strive for greater things.

Mrs. Hattie Jackson passed away on January 13, 2013 at 88 years of age. She leaves to cherish her memory two daughters and their husbands, Zita and Glenn Blankenship, and Cheri and Joseph Harrell as well as five grandchildren, two great granddaughters, a host of loving and supportive nieces, nephews, cousins, extended family and friends. I extend my heartfelt appreciation for the life and work of Hattie Elie Jackson. Hers was a life well-lived.

LAKE CHARLES AWARDED ACADIANA'S CITY OF THE YEAR

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the city of Lake Charles for its recent selection by the Acadiana Profile magazine as the city of the year. Lake Charles continues to make major progress improving the economic opportunities and cultural life for its citizens. In the next few years, approximately 34,000 jobs will be generated in the petrochemical industry due to significant and meaningful commitments to the region by international companies including Sasol and Cheniere Energy, Inc. Also, the Calcasieu Parish and the city of Lake Charles' tourism produced $358 million just last year alone and this number is expected to increase in the future. Furthermore, residents are enjoying the luxuries of a more personable and hospitable community, with the new Millennium Park serving as a pillar of the downtown area.

Due to the redevelopment of the downtown area, the Charpentier Historic District is more inviting than ever. With seventy-five festivals held annually in addition to the construction of the National Hurricane Museum and Science Center, Lake Charles' impressive progress will continue into the future.

I am proud of Lake Charles' improvements and want to commend Mayor Randy Roach and the City Council for their vision and dedication.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 31 on Motion to Suspend the Rules and pass H.R. 225, the National Pediatric Research Network Act of 2013. I was unable to vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND TITLE IV OF THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974 TO PROVIDE FOR A GUARANTEE BY THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION FOR QUALIFIED PRERETIREMENT SURVIVOR ANNUITIES UNDER INSOLVENT OR TERMINATED MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION PLANS

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to rectify an inequity regarding the benefits provided to surviving spouses through the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC). I am pleased to be joined by Representative ROB ANDREWS in this effort.

PBGC provides pre-retirement survivor coverage, which provides a benefit to the surviving spouse of a pension participant who dies before retirement. However, in the case of a multiemployer pension plan turned over to PBGC, this benefit is guaranteed only if the plan participant dies before the plan is turned over. For single-employer plans the benefit is guaranteed regardless of when the participant dies.

The PBGC website acknowledges this discrepancy, stating

. . . For the most part, the PBGC guarantees the same type of benefits for multiemployer pension plans as for benefits in the

single-employer program, with the exception that preretirement survivor annuities are forfeitable in multiemployer plans if the participant has not died as of the termination date.

The debate over how to best provide income security for older Americans will continue for some time. However, in the meantime, it is unconscionable that a widow or widower would be denied the modest benefits provided under the PBGC multiemployer plan simply because his or her spouse did not die before the plan was turned over to the PBGC.

This discrepancy appears inadvertent and deserves to be corrected by Congress. I ask my colleagues for their support of this legislation so we can address this issue quickly.

HONORING KRISTINA ''KRISTY'' MARIE SERMERSHEIM

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge and honor Kristina ''Kristy'' Marie Sermersheim. I first met Kristy more than 30 years ago. I was a brash candidate for office not backed by the establishment and not expected to win. Kristy was a union activist who didn't know the meaning of the word ''no''. Together we challenged the conventional wisdom. Voters decided that an emphasis on children and families was what they cared about. I was elected to the Board of Supervisors of Santa Clara County. That same year, in 1981, she became a full-time Service Employees International Union (SEIU) staff member.

The financial roof fell in on the county shortly thereafter, the impact of Proposition 13. Neither of us wanted a reduction in services to people in need. But we faced the imperative of reductions.

We worked together to cut the budget, to make sure that as we dealt with the budget reality we protected the most vulnerable and never scapegoated our employees. Kristy Sermersheim proved her bona fides in those tough times. She was smart, pragmatic but idealistic. She had values. She stood up for her members and she stood up for those in need. She was a star.

She continued to represent workers for another 32 years. As a passionate advocate for workers' rights, she held a range of positions on various local, state, national, and international organizations, including SEIU Local 715, SEIU International Union, South Bay American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL–CIO) Labor Council, California Labor Federation, SEIU Public Services Division, and SEIU California State Council. Kristy assumed the leadership role of SEIU local 715, the largest union representing employees of Santa Clara County.

Born in New Albany, Indiana, during elementary school, her family lived in Michigan, San Diego, and Long Beach, California. In 1961, her family moved to San Jose. In 1967, she graduated from Leigh High School. Kristy's good grades earned accolades as a National Merit Scholar Finalist and she was voted ''Most Likely to Succeed'' by her classmates. After she graduated, she took classes at San Jose State University and began working as a Santa Clara County Social Services Eligibility Worker in the Welfare Department.

Kristy has devoted her life to social justice and workers' rights. She served 11 years as a member leader for the Santa Clara County Employees Association.

As head of the former SEIU Local 715 in Santa Clara and San Mateo counties, Kristy expanded the union from 5,000 members working for four employers to more than 30,000 members with over 20 different contracts. She led the consolidation of five unions, including Local 715, to form the new SEIU Local 521. As Chief Elected Office of SEIU 521, she fought on behalf of 57,000 workers throughout North and Central California. Under her leadership, the County of Santa Clara and SEIU negotiated an $80 million settlement that established pay equity by removing discrimination in wage-setting for women and people of color.

We worked together for rights for women. Kristy helped make sure that the union represented a female worker in the county roads department in an affirmative action case that went all the way to the United States Supreme Court. County government was her partner in the case. I remember so well listening to the oral arguments on that case as a young County Supervisor. We were proud that local government and the union were partners in the quest for equal rights for women.

The case confirmed that government agencies must consider previous discrimination history as well as qualifications when making hiring decisions. In recognition of over 40 years of contributions to the social and political advancement of women, Kristy was awarded the South Bay AFL–CIO Labor Council's 2012 COPE Award for Service Above Self.

Throughout her career, Kristy worked together with public workers to obtain improvements in working conditions, wages, and benefits. She forged alliances with other unions and community groups to improve public services to the residents union members serve. Kristy is now retired and lives in Morgan Hill with her two sisters, Andrea and Teresa. The three sisters have collectively raised their brother's children after he passed away. They live with their niece Flori, a little dog, and three cats. In her retirement, Kristy wants to help the developmentally disabled community and volunteer where she can make a difference. I join in honoring her decades of contribution and service to the betterment of our society. The community is very fortunate to have benefited from her advocacy, dedication, and leadership. She has left her mark in the community and I know she will continue to play a positive role.

COMMEMORATING THE 21ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE KHOJALY MASSACRE

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 21st anniversary of the Khojaly massacre perpetrated by Armenian armed forces on February 25–26, 1992 in the town of Khojaly in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan. Khojaly, now under the occupation of Armenian armed forces, was the site of the largest killing of ethnic Azerbaijani civilians in the course of the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict.

Khojaly, once the home to 7,000 people, was completely destroyed. Six hundred thirteen people were killed, of which 106 were women, 83 were children and 56 were purported to have been killed with extreme cruelty and torture. In addition, 1,275 people were taken hostage, 150 went missing and 487 people became disabled. Also in the records maintained, 76 of the victims were teenagers, 8 families were wiped out and 25 children lost both of their parents while 130 lost one of their parents. According to Human Rights Watch and other international observers, the Armenian Armed forces were reportedly aided by the Russian 366th Motor Rifle Regiment.

At the time, Newsweek magazine reported: ''Azerbaijan was a charnel house again last week: a place of mourning refugees and dozens of mangled corpses dragged to a makeshift morgue behind the mosque. They were ordinary Azerbaijani men, women and children of Khojaly, a small village in war-torn Nagorno-Karabakh overrun by Armenian forces on 25–26 February. Many were killed at close range while trying to flee; some had their faces mutilated, others were scalped.''

As part of the Khojaly population that tried to escape, they encountered violent ambushes that led to abuses, torture, mutilation and death. The Russian organization, Memorial, stated that 200 Azerbaijani corpses were brought from Khojaly to Agdam within four days.

Time magazine published the following description: ''While the details are argued, this much is plain: something grim and unconscionable happened in the Azerbaijani town of Khojaly 2 weeks ago. So far, some 200 dead Azerbaijanis, many of them mutilated, have been transported out of the town tucked inside the Armenian-dominated enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh for burial in neighboring Azerbaijan. The total number of deaths—the Azerbaijanis claim 1,324 civilians have been slaughtered, most of them women and children—is unknown.''

The extent of the cruelty of this massacre against women, children and the elderly was unfathomable. This anniversary reminds us of the need to redouble efforts to help resolve the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict. The United States as a Co-Chair of the OSCE Minsk Group should intensify its efforts to reach a resolution of this protracted conflict.

Mr. Speaker, Azerbaijan is a strong ally of the United States in a strategically important and complex region of the world. I ask my colleagues to join me and our Azerbaijani friends in commemorating the tragedy that occurred in the town of Khojaly.

TERRITORIAL SEA

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will return to the people of the Northern Marianas ownership of the three

miles of submerged lands surrounding each of our islands. In doing so, this bill also puts the management of these lands back in the hands of those who have the greatest interest in protecting the natural resources there and in developing their economic potential—the people of the Northern Mariana Islands.

I say ''return'' because, until 2005, we believed we owned these lands around our islands; and we cared for them accordingly. But in 2005 the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that—unlike the case for every other coastal state and territory in our Nation—the submerged lands and waters off our shores did not belong to us, but rather belonged to the federal government.

The Court did acknowledge in its ruling that Congress had the authority to convey these lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; and it is that authority that my bill would exercise.

We have been here before. In three previous Congresses legislation has been offered to provide the same ownership of submerged lands to the Northern Mariana Islands as is enjoyed by American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. In 2005 Representative Jeff Flake of Arizona—now Senator Jeff Flake—introduced H.R. 4255 for this purpose. And in 2009, when for the first time the people of the Northern Mariana Islands themselves were represented in this House, I introduced H.R. 934, conveying these lands. That bill passed the House without dissent, 416–0, in July of 2009, but died in the Senate. Again in 2011 I introduced this legislation, as H.R. 670. Again the House passed the bill without dissent, 397–0. Again the Senate failed to act, although the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee held a hearing on a companion measure, S. 590, sponsored by Senator Jeff Bingaman and Senator LISA MURKOWSKI.

In each Congress each bill introduced on this issue has progressed farther down the legislative track.

I hope the fourth time proves to be the charm.

We know from past action that this House supports local control of these local resources in the Northern Mariana Islands. The Obama Administration has testified in favor of the conveyance. And I can attest that my constituents desire equivalent treatment to other U.S. coastal jurisdictions. So, we just have to give the other body one more opportunity to join in this wide agreement.

Let me add that the cost of the measure I have introduced is nothing and that Congress has the Constitutional authority to enact this bill—two threshold questions that we must always answer.

And let me thank the hundreds of Members who voted in favor of this conveyance in the 111th and 112th Congresses and all those Members who are original co-sponsors of today's measure, which provides the right of ownership and responsibility of management for submerged lands and waters to the Northern Mariana Islands that every other coastal area of our Nation enjoys.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF REVEREND JAMES S. YOUNG

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to recognize Reverend James S. Young for his selfless service to the Northwest Florida community.

Reverend Young founded the Pensacola chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference more than 50 years ago after an inspirational meeting with Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in Birmingham, Alabama. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference not only played a critical role in the civil rights movement, but continues to push for effective policy in four major realms: economic development, education, community empowerment, and technology.

Reverend Young's contributions to the civil rights movement include working closely with local ministers and leaders to organize boycotts throughout the city in order to further their cause for justice. Under his leadership, several ministerial and civil leaders were able to conduct meetings with businesses specifically regarding merchants' discrimination practices. Most notably, Reverend Young was selected to meet with the Supreme Court Judges in Washington, D.C. to participate in a discussion on segregation issues. The list of Reverend Young's accomplishments extends far beyond what is noted here, but they all highlight his devotion to improving the lives of those around him and to bettering his community through service.

In addition to his involvement with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Reverend Young serves as the Dean of the Baptist Ministers Union of Pensacola, the Executive Director of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemorative Celebration Committee, and senior pastor at Mt. Canaan Ministry Baptist Church. He also offers his leadership and expertise as a member of the NAACP, the Ministerial Association, and the God in Government Committee.

Reverend Young's commitment to service and passion for bettering the lives of others has been recognized through the countless awards bestowed to him; most recently with proclamations from the Pensacola Mayor and County Commission. For the past several decades, Reverend Young has served his community and organization with unwavering dedication. There is no question that Reverend Young has left an invaluable impact on not only Northwest Florida, but to the national human rights and justice movement as well.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pride to recognize Reverend James S. Young for his lifetime of service. My wife Vicki joins me in wishing James and his wife Marie all of the best.

IN HONOR OF WILLIE F. MONDAY

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, Bill Monday of Locust, North Carolina, dedicated his life to the service of his country. His military career and civic service make admirers of all those fortunate enough to have known him.

Bill Monday selflessly volunteered for service in June of 1940 and was sent to Ft. Bragg as part of the 4th Field Artillery Battalion in the United States Army Air Corps.

Bill's long and distinguished career in the Corps began with his enlistment and ended with his promotion to Captain after his skill and commitment to duty qualified him for Officer Candidate School. He went on to qualify and earn his wings as a Field Artillery Liaison Pilot.

During his military career, Bill was stationed throughout the South Pacific though the bulk of the action he saw was in the ferocious campaign for the Philippines in October of 1944. In this campaign Bill's intrepid flying ability allowed him to land on small dirt roads and school yards in order direct fire, provide reconnaissance, and drop supplies to cut off troops. All of this was done with nothing more than a thin layer of plywood to protect him from the rain of anti-aircraft and small arms fire.

It was here, flying up to ten miles behind enemy lines in an unarmed aircraft, that Bill earned a Silver Star in December of 1944. This was followed up by the Air Medal with Oak Leaf Clusters in June and September of 1945.

His Silver Star citation reads: ''Flying from short, hazardous fields, he was not able to take an observer with him, but was nonetheless able to make accurate and skilled adjustments of artillery fire. By his outstanding courage and willingness to meet military necessities beyond the call of his normal duties, Lieutenant Monday conducted himself in a manner worthy of the highest traditions of the military service.''

After the war ended, Bill returned to Fort Bragg. After being discharged in August of 1949 he settled in Locust, NC with his wife, Virginia, where he lived a long prosperous life.

Bill loved flying and said that even during wartime there was a peace to flying and that he never felt closer to God than when he was in the air alone. As he is laid to rest, let us hope that he finds that same peace.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to call his extraordinary service and devotion to the United States to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF TED SCHLOSSMAN

HON. RANDY NEUGEBAUER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember Ted Schlossman, a great husband, father, and grandfather. He was an outstanding businessman, a volunteer in his community, and a friend of mine. Ted passed away unexpectedly Sunday, January 20, 2013, while attending a conference. I know the contributions he left us with will not be forgotten by his family, friends, or his community.

I had the privilege of knowing Ted for more than 20 years and his dedication and service to the housing industry has truly made a difference. Ted was not only a strong advocate

for the industry, but served in numerous leadership capacities. When you wanted something done, you wanted Ted on your team. It is fitting that Ted departed this earth on the way to chair a meeting.

Ted wore many hats in the residential construction industry throughout his career. He did everything from serving as a supplier of doors and windows to building houses in both Texas and Virginia. Before he moved to Texas in 1983, Ted served as president of both the Tidewater Builders Association and the Virginia State Home Builders Association in Virginia. Ted was also recognized for his service to the industry with numerous awards. In 2011, he was inducted into the Texas Association of Builders Housing Hall of Honor.

Ted lived the American Dream that so many of us strive for. He enjoyed a loving family and a thriving career. Ted has left a legacy that many people will enjoy for years to come through the homes he built and the lives he touched.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in extending my sincere thanks to Ted Schlossman, for leaving this world a better place than he found it. I am truly honored to recognize my friend and his accomplishments. He will be missed.

HONORING THE 4TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LILLY LEDBETTER FAIR PAY ACT

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the progress we've made in ensuring equal pay for equal work, and the 4th year anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. Lilly Ledbetter performed equal work but received less pay than her male colleagues at Goodyear. Despite experiencing pay discrimination over the course of her career, Ledbetter was barred by the Supreme Court from challenging her discriminatory pay because she did not pursue legal action soon enough.

Fortunately, this is no longer the case. On January 29, 2009, President Obama signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act into law. This law restored an employee's right to challenge pay discrimination. Women today have the right to pursue legal action for pay discrimination whenever it occurs.

Despite this victory, challenges still remain for women receiving equal pay for equal work as evidenced by the pay gap that still exists. Today, women are paid only 77 cents to every dollar made by men. And for women of color, that number falls even lower. African American women receive 68 cents and Hispanic women 59 cents to every dollar earned by men. This pay disparity not only affects women during their careers, but follows them into retirement as they receive lower pensions and Social Security benefits based on receiving lower wages than they deserved.

Although today we take a moment to celebrate the restoration of the right to challenge pay discrimination, now more than ever, we must strengthen our resolve to ensure equal pay for equal work. Eliminating pay discrimination not only benefits women—it benefits families. In most American households today, women are either the sole breadwinner or essential co-breadwinner. Those families rely on women's income to meet the daily needs of the family—including groceries, rent, and medical care. As we celebrate the 4th anniversary of this important law, we must commit to passing the Paycheck Fairness Act now to take another major step in ensuring equal pay for equal work.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DELEGATE CHRISTINE M. JONES

HON. DONNA F. EDWARDS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Christine M. Jones, a resident of Temple Hills in the Fourth Congressional District of Maryland. She unexpectedly passed from this life on January 26, 2013. As her funeral service is this coming Friday at Bethlehem Baptist Church on Martin Luther King Avenue in Southeast Washington, DC, I want to remember the legacy Ms. Jones leaves behind.

Ms. Christine Jones's long and distinguished career served the people of Maryland for over 40 years both as a teacher in Prince George's County and in the Maryland House of Delegates. Delegate Jones served as a mentor and inspiration to countless individuals throughout our state. All of Maryland mourns the loss of a great woman and unparalleled public servant.

Delegate Jones was born in Navasota, Texas, on Christmas Day in 1929. She graduated from the historically black university, Huston—Tillotson University, in Austin, Texas, in 1949 with a Bachelor of Arts degree.

Delegate Jones had a long career as a teacher and educator in the Prince George's County Public Schools system and specialized in physical education. Just as she lived her life, she stressed service to those students that were lucky enough to have her as a teacher and mentor.

After a 30 year career as an educator, Ms. Jones decided to continue her public service on behalf of Prince George's County by becoming the first African American to represent the County in the Maryland General Assembly. She represented the 26th Legislative District in the House of Delegates from 1982–1994. Delegate Jones rose to the position of vice chairman of the County's delegation and was the first woman to serve as chairperson of the Legislative Black Caucus of Maryland. In her last year in office in 1994, she worked as the Assembly's assistant majority floor leader. The Legislative Black Caucus recognized Delegate Jones for her contributions and service to the state of Maryland and its residents in 2010.

After her time in office, Delegate Jones continued to be active in her community through service in political, educational, and religious organizations. With her passing, it is my hope that Christine M. Jones has found the peace earned from such a wonderful life. Delegate Jones made a difference in our community with everything she did, and I am grateful for her life and service to Prince George's County, Maryland, and our country.

On behalf of this House, I extend our condolences to her entire family, especially her son, Robert E. Jones, Jr., her three grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren, and the thanks of a grateful nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during the rollcall vote No. 5, on January 3, 2013. I would like the record to reflect that I would have voted "yes."

OPINION EDITORIAL WRITTEN BY MARION P. HAMMER OF FLORIDA

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues an opinion editorial that was written by Marion P. Hammer, of Tallahassee, Florida.

Marion has diligently served as a staunch advocate for Second Amendment Rights for nearly her entire life. She served as the first female President of the National Rifle Association (NRA) from 1995 through 1998, and remains on the NRA Board of Directors today.

The opinion editorial explains in very plain language, just like our Second Amendment, the glaring problems our nation's one hundred million gun owners, sportsmen and women, and law abiding citizens have with the misguided proposals we are hearing from the President and his Democratic colleagues.

"UNIVERSAL BACKGROUND CHECKS"—ABSOLUTELY NOT

(By Marion P. Hammer)

Imagine a grandfather who wants to give a family shotgun to his 12-year-old grandson having to do a background check on his grandson before giving him the shotgun.

Or a friend having to do a background check on his lifetime best buddy before lending him a hunting rifle.

Or, if your mother had a prowler at her home, having to do a background check on your own Mom before you could give her one of your guns for protection.

That's what "universal background checks" do. They turn traditional innocent conduct into a criminal offense. They target you, law-abiding gun owners.

Universal background checks are background checks on EVERY transfer, sale, purchase, trade, gift, rental, and loan of a firearm between any and all individuals.

All background checks must be conducted through a federally licensed dealer. Universal background checks have nothing to do with gun shows—they are about you.

It is ALREADY a federal felony to be engaged in the business of buying and selling firearms without having federal firearm dealer's license.

It is ALREADY a crime for a federally licensed dealer to sell a gun without doing a background check—that's all dealers, everywhere, including at retail stores, gun shows, flea markets or anywhere else.

Further, it is ALREADY a federal felony for any private person to sell, trade, give, lend, rent or transfer a gun to a person you know or should have known is not legally allowed to own, purchase or possess a firearm.

The penalty for selling a gun to a person who is a criminal, mentally ill, mentally incompetent, alcohol abuser or drug abuser is a 10-year federal felony. That's now, today, with no changes to the law.

It is even a federal felony to submit false information on a background check form for the purpose of purchasing a firearm.

Even so, according to a 2012 report to the Department of Justice, more than 72,000 people were turned down on a gun purchase in 2010 because they didn't pass the background check. Yet, only 44 of those cases were prosecuted. Why, when criminals are caught in the act of lying on the form to illegally purchase a firearm are they not prosecuted?

On Thursday, January 10, 2013, in the White House meeting of President Obama's Gun Agenda Task Force, Vice President Joe Biden answered that question, telling NRA's Director of Federal Affairs, James Baker, that the Obama administration didn't have time to prosecute people for lying on the federal background check form.

In an article in The Daily Caller (1/18/2013) Biden said, ''And to your point, Mr. Baker, regarding the lack of prosecutions on lying on Form 4473s, we simply don't have the time or manpower to prosecute everybody who lies on a form, that checks a wrong box, that answers a question inaccurately.''

If the Obama Administration currently doesn't have the time or manpower to prosecute those who lie on background check forms, then why do they want more background checks, more paperwork and more forms? It's backdoor gun registration.

Universal background check system legislation that we have previously seen, allows the government to keep a computerized government registry of gun owners.

In addition to the absurdity of having to do background checks on people you know are not criminals, would you like to pay up to $100 or more just to give your grandson a shotgun or lend a hunting rifle to your best friend or give your Mom a gun for protection?

Transfer fees alone could run from $50 up. Firearms dealers, like other businesses, charge as much as they can get away with. Background check fees for a federally mandated program can be any amount they decide.

The Obama administration's gun ban agenda and universal background check system are unconstitutional regulatory schemes to gut the Second Amendment. These proposals which mandate the government collection of data on lawful gun buyers and sellers amount to universal gun registration and gun owner licensing.

This agenda focuses on peaceable citizens, not violent criminals who obtain guns on the black-market to carry out unspeakable crimes already prohibited under federal and state laws. Instead of stopping crime and eliminating criminal conduct, they are creating more criminals—they are targeting you.

That's why NRA Members and the nation's 100 million firearms owners will stand in solidarity and fight against these misguided and diabolical proposals that have nothing whatsoever to do with curbing criminal violence but everything to do with stripping us of our guaranteed civil rights and our freedom.

Marion P. Hammer is past President of the National Rifle Association and is Executive Director of Unified Sportsmen of Florida

HONORING DONALD VAUGHN, FORMER CHIEF ENGINEER, ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to pay tribute to Mr. Donald W. Vaughn, a distinguished civil servant of the State of Alabama who will be inducted into the Alabama Engineering Hall of Fame on February, 23, 2013.

A 1971 graduate of Auburn University's School of Engineering, Don Vaughn served the Alabama Highway Department for more than 40 years before retiring in 2012. His contributions to the enhancement of Alabama's transportation system over the last four decades are reflected in the state's modern highways and continued emphasis on traffic safety.

Don holds a lifelong passion for engineering that began even before he earned his degree. Indeed, he started work as a survey party member for the Alabama Highway Department in 1966 at the same he entered college. He spent summer breaks and between quarters assisting state surveyor crews even as he studied at Auburn University. After graduation in 1972, Don began full-time work in the Alabama Highway Department's Engineering Education Training Program as a Graduate Civil Engineer. He subsequently rose in the ranks, starting as an Interstate Bureau Engineer, 1973–1976, Assistant Location Engineer, 1976–1979, Location Engineer, 1980–1983, Assistant Chief of Design Bureau, 1983–1987, Bureau Chief of Office Engineer Bureau, 1987–1989, and, in July 1989, he was appointed Administrative Engineer to the Transportation Director.

Under Governor Fob James, Don was promoted to Assistant Transportation Director on October 1, 1997. He served in that position until February 1999 when he was appointed Assistant Chief Engineer. Governor Donald Siegelman appointed him Assistant Transportation Director on July 1, 2001. He was appointed to the position of Deputy Director, Operations in February 2003. On June 1, 2005, Don was appointed Chief Engineer by Governor Bob Riley.

An active leader in Alabama and national transportation organizations, Don was President of the Alabama Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Chairman of the Traffic Safety Committee, Chairman of the US Route Numbering Committee, and Chairman of the Subcommittee on Safety Management of the Standing Committee on Highways of the American Association of State and Highway Transportation Officials. He also served on the Alabama Enterprise Zone Advisory Council, the Inland Waterways and Intermodal Infrastructure Advisory Board, and the Alabama Toll Road, Bridge and Tunnel Authority.

Don retired at the rank of Commander in the U.S. Naval Reserves Civil Engineer Corps and was the 2009 Auburn University Outstanding Civil Engineer Alumnus.

On behalf of the people of Alabama, I would like to extend personal congratulations to Don on his induction into the Alabama Engineering Hall of Fame. His service to improving the quality and safety of Alabama's roads, bridges and transportation infrastructure is second to none.

I wish Don and his wife, Becki, and their entire family the very best in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING PATRICIA ''PATTY'' BENNETT AS THE 2012 CITIZEN OF THE YEAR FOR THE TOWN OF NOVATO, CALIFORNIA

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Novato resident Patricia (Patty) Bennett as the 2012 Citizen of the Year for the Town of Novato located in Mann County in Northern California.

Patty's enduring service to the town is marked by her quiet presence and many positive outcomes. As a local community activist committed to the growth and care of the Novato community, Patty has been serving on various committees around town for many years. Since 2004, Patty Bennett has served on the board of the Novato Youth Center (NYC), where in addition to her duties as Vice-President of the NYC Board and chairperson of the Development Committee, she founded and co-chairs their biannual fundraising event Cruisin' the Classics.

Patty's strong compassion for working parents motivated her to join NYC board of directors in 2004 to help make accessible quality childcare for these parents. Among her many contributions as a director, Patty played a critical role in transitioning the leadership of the NYC after the retirement of an Executive Director who served 23 years.

Patty's dedication to Novato has remained constant though the years. She currently serves as Treasurer for ''Novato 2010—Celebrating 50 years'' Birthday Celebration Steering Committee and has worked for many years on the Coordinating Committee for the Paint the Town Red event. She is also an Elder at the Presbyterian Church of Novato and has served as President of the Parent Teacher Association for Pleasant Valley Elementary School and on Leadership Councils for Novato Unified School District schools including Pleasant Valley Elementary, Sinaloa Middle and San Marin High School.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, it is appropriate that we honor Patty Bennett for her exceptional community service and civic engagement, commend her generosity of spirit and extend to her our congratulations for her selection as the 2012 Citizen of the Year.

WHERE'S THE BUDGET

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Groundhog Day has come and gone.

The little fella did not see his shadow, and once again, Congress saw no budget from the White House.

That's right, MS, for the fourth time in five years this Administration has missed its legally required deadline to submit a budget.

The Budget Act of 1974 says: "On or after the first Monday in January but not later than the first Monday in February of each year, the President shall submit a budget of the United States Government for the following fiscal year."

But once again the White House ignores laws it doesn't like.

Ironically, the Administration missed the legal deadline the same day that the "No Budget No Pay" act was signed into law.

That law freezes pay for Members of Congress unless we pass our own budget by April 15.

Last year, the President's tardy budget failed to receive a single vote in either Chamber.

So what's the plan now?

Show us the budget.

Your move, Mr. President.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, due to constituent obligations in my district, I was unavoidably detained in Massachusetts on February 4, 2012. I was therefore unable to cast a vote on rollcall votes 31, and 32. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 31, and "yea" on rollcall 32.

HONORING THE LIFE OF R. BRIAN KIDNEY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues and former members of the California State Legislature Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. WAXMAN to pay tribute to the life of R. Brian Kidney, who passed away on December 22, 2012 at the age of 82. Mr. Kidney was an extraordinary person, and he will always be remembered as a man who lived his life with purpose and a dedication to public service, with almost 30 years in the California State Assembly, Office of the Chief Clerk.

Brian Kidney earned a Bachelor's degree in Russian History from the University of Michigan. He went on to further his education at the University of San Francisco and earned a Master's degree in Government. Upon completion of his Master's degree, Mr. Kidney joined the United States Air Force and served our nation as a Russian Translator in Libya.

His impressive and irreplaceable service to the State of California began in 1963 in the California State Legislature, where he served as an office messenger for Assembly Speaker Jesse Unruh. Two years later he became assistant clerk, and in 1991, Mr. Kidney retired after serving 25 years as chief clerk.

Mr. Kidney was an expert at his profession, but he brought more than knowledge and expertise to work every day. His understanding of the legislative process was an asset to each member who served in the California State Assembly during his tenure. Mr. Kidney's passion for government positively impacted the State of California in numerous ways.

In 1989, Mr. Kidney created the Assembly Chief Clerk Legislative Internship Program. He recognized the importance of having young minds with innovative ideas in the office, and paid interns began to work full-time alongside staff to gain the most fruitful experience possible. The interns benefit from their involvement and the office gains a fresh perspective from the interns.

Mr. Kidney did not stop working after retirement. He served as a parliamentary consultant to governments in Hungary, Malawi, Namibia, and South Africa, and spent several years as a lobbyist for The Gualco Group.

However, life did not always revolve around politics for Mr. Kidney. He never took for granted the simplicity of a great meal surrounded by conversation and laughter with his family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. WAXMAN in paying tribute to the life and career of R. Brian Kidney. He was a shining example of a true public servant and proud American.

TRIBUTE TO STATE SENATOR HINTON MITCHEM

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a long-time Alabama political leader and businessman who dutifully served the Tennessee Valley region for more than 30 years in Montgomery. Former State Senator Hinton Mitchem, of Union Grove, passed away on January 22, 2013, after an extended illness.

A Georgia native and a 1961 graduate of the University of Georgia, Senator Mitchem served in the United States Coast Guard before moving west to Alabama in 1962 to pursue his future. It was not long before he left a mark on his community by becoming both a successful businessman and a respected public official.

In 1965, Senator Mitchem founded Hinton Mitchem Tractor Co., Inc. in Albertville and continued to serve the farming community for 40 years before selling his business in 2005. He first entered politics as a member of the Albertville City Council in 1968. In 1974, he was elected to the Alabama House of Representatives, representing the 25th District, serving a single four-year term from 1975 through 1979. He then ran and won election for State Senate in 1979. His Senate district included Marshall County and parts of Blount, Madison, and at one time, DeKalb County.

In 1986, Senator Mitchem set his gaze towards higher office, entering the Democrat primary for Lieutenant Governor. After coming in third in the statewide contest, he returned to the Senate a year later easily winning a special election created when a vacancy occurred in his former Senate seat.

A statesman who was respected by politicians on both sides of the aisle, Senator Mitchem was elected President Pro Tempore of the Alabama Senate on January 9, 2007. He chaired the Finance and Taxation and Education Committees and, twice, the General Fund Committee. He was selected as one of the five Outstanding Senators in 1983 and again in 1984. In 1985, he was voted by his colleagues "The Outstanding Senator" in Alabama. When he retired from public office in 2010, he held the distinction of being the longest-serving member in the Alabama House and Senate, having served a total of 36 years.

Upon his retirement in 2010, Senator Mitchem told the Arab Tribune that his single most significant legislative accomplishment for his constituents was the passage of a bill directing TVA "payment in lieu of taxes" funds to the Alabama counties in which the federal utility is located. Prior to the passage of the legislation, the Alabama general fund received the TVA payments. Senator Mitchem also sponsored legislation creating the Alabama Housing Finance Authority, and was a staunch supporter of Alabama's two-year college system and Alabama's State Parks, to name but a few of his many contributions.

Senator Mitchem's public service was not limited to elected office. In 1980, he was appointed by then-Republican Governor Fob James, Jr. to chair the Alabama Governor's Commission on Physical Fitness, serving in that capacity for 28 years. He also served 18 consecutive years as Chairman of the Alabama Special Olympics.

On behalf of the people of Alabama, I wish to extend my personal condolences to his wife, Judy; and their four children, Todd, Tanya, Dee and Brittnie; their three grandchildren and their extended family. You are all in our thoughts and prayers.

TRIBUTE TO THE MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY'S ELECTRIC EDGE BAND

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the talented musicians of the "Morehead State University and Electric Edge" band, which performed at the renowned Kentucky Society of Washington DC's Inaugural Bluegrass Ball on Saturday, January 19, 2013. Known for its high class entertainment, fine food, and Kentucky hospitality, the Bluegrass Ball is our premier inauguration party, made even more memorable when Electric Edge takes the stage.

Great music is synonymous with the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and so it has been my pleasure to welcome these gifted educators and musicians to the nation's Capitol City.

In fact, music has always been an important way of life in Kentucky. We enjoy a rich music heritage from Appalachia on into the cornfields of western Kentucky. In classrooms and on stage, these band members are helping keep

our proud musical traditions alive, while training up the next generation of Loretta Lynns and Ricky Scaggs. A couple weekends ago, their abilities were on display at the Bluegrass Ball, indulging us with the melodies of Kentucky right here in Washington, DC.

The band includes nationally and internationally acclaimed members, some of them on the distinguished faculty of Morehead State University. They include hit-chart writer and singer Tony Pence, Professor Glenn Ginn on electric guitar, Professor Gordon Towell on Saxophone, Professor Steven Snyder on piano, Danny Cecil on bass, vocalist-favorite Lisa Ginn, and Paul Deatherage on percussion.

It likewise goes without saying that great food is synonymous with the Commonwealth of Kentucky. So, I'm also very pleased to recognize one of our nation's most celebrated chefs, Edward Lee, of Kentucky's famous "610 Magnolia" restaurant, who smartly found his way from New York to the Kentucky Derby and decided to stay. Chef Lee has a huge following as an alumnus of the "Iron Chef of America" and "Top Chef" television programs. One of his favorite foods is fried chicken, and he loves animals, especially horses. A true Kentucky gentleman, he graciously provided an exquisite three-course dinner for the Bluegrass Ball.

I ask the Congress to join me in thanking the band and chef for showcasing their extraordinary talents and participating in the 57th Presidential Inauguration festivities.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 2013

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program was first created in 1999, because there were not nearly enough pediatricians and pediatric subspecialists to serve the children of our country. The program has been overwhelmingly successful, increasing the number of pediatricians by 35 percent. Today, CHGME provides funding to train more than 40 percent of pediatricians in the U.S. However, at current funding levels, we still don't have enough providers to treat the unique needs of children in our country.

I cannot emphasize enough how critical this funding is to stand-alone children's hospitals, such as Lucile Packard Children's Hospital in my Congressional District. We have a responsibility to help train the next generation of pediatricians who will care for our children through the earliest, and often the most critical time of their lives. Under the Affordable Care Act, all Americans will have access to healthcare, but we have to ensure we have an adequate medical workforce to care for them.

I look forward to the passage of CHGME reauthorization in the House, and I will continue to work with my colleagues in the Senate to see that we move forward with a bill that can swiftly pass both bodies and be sent to the President for his signature.

TRIBUTE TO MS. MOLLY F. RYAN

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of a friend, constituent, and faithful public servant, Ms. Molly F. Ryan of Rouses Point, New York, and to congratulate her on her new endeavor as Manager of Community Outreach at the Champlain Valley Physicians Hospital (CVPH).

Ms. Ryan was one of the first to join my staff when I was elected to Congress in 2009, and for over three years, loyally served constituents of New York's 23rd Congressional District. While running my Plattsburgh District Office, she successfully assisted hundreds of constituents with their casework, and did so each and every day with an uplifting smile and positive attitude. Although her tenure was short, my constituents and the State of New York are fortunate to have benefitted from her commitment to public service.

It has been a pleasure to work with Ms. Ryan, and I look forward to seeing her in Plattsburgh in the years to come. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating her on her new position and wishing her all the best in what is sure to be a long and prosperous career.

NONADMITTED AND REINSURANCE REFORM ACT (NRRA)

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an important issue regarding the implementation of the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act (NRRA). The NRRA is legislation that I co-authored and was signed into law as part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

The NRRA was drafted with the specific intention of addressing burdensome and often conflicting regulatory and tax compliance issues facing only two industries—the surplus lines and reinsurance. This legislation received bi-partisan support and was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives in multiple Congresses. At no point during the bill's multi-year consideration was its application to the captive insurance industry ever discussed.

Unfortunately, several states have indicated that they plan to interpret the NRRA to also apply to the captive insurance industry. This was not the intent of Congress. In drafting this legislation, it was never contemplated to have the captive industry fall under the NRRA. In addition, this legislation has been subject to numerous Congressional hearings and has been approved by this body on multiple occasions. At no time was the legislation's application to the captive industry addressed or suggested. Furthermore, in the bill's summary, the intent of this legislation was clearly stated to impact only two specific industries—surplus lines and reinsurance.

Inaccurate and inconsistent interpretations will cause confusion throughout the captive insurance industry. Should regulators implement this faulty interpretation, captive insurance companies would be subject to additional taxation and regulation—the exact opposite intent of the underlying legislation.

As one of the authors of this legislation, I am committed to ensuring that this title of Dodd-Frank is implemented as Congress intended, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee to address this issue if necessary in the future.

RECOGNIZING DAVID OLIKER'S THIRTY YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate David W. Oliker's 30 years as President and Chief Executive Officer of MVP Health Care. Mr. Oliker has been a successful and steadfast advocate for improved health care and economic prosperity in my Congressional district, but will be retiring during this calendar year.

Through Mr. Oliker's efforts, MVP Health Care has become a leader in the promotion of wellness and health education in our communities as a vehicle to lower health care costs and drive collective well-being. As a non-profit organization, MVP Health Care demonstrates what a truly successful public-private partnership looks like.

Advancing our nation's educational system has also been a priority of Mr. Oliker's. He has served on multiple boards, including the Advisory Council of Union Graduate College and the Albany College of Pharmacy. His hard work has ensured that generations to come will be well prepared for the future.

It has been an honor and a privilege to work with Mr. Oliker and I wish him the best in his retirement. The health care system in the Northeast will not be the same without him.

CELEBRATING ROSA PARKS' 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest appreciation for the life, legacy, and actions of Mrs. Rosa Parks on what would have been her 100th birthday.

Our society today, is a far cry from the one into which Mrs. Parks was born. We are now living in a time that is a direct reflection of the efforts of the trailblazers who came before us.

Trailblazers like Rosa Parks, Shirley Chisholm, Frederick Douglas, Martin Luther King, Barbara Jordan and Walter Fauntroy whose actions transformed history and paved the way for a brighter future for all of us. Remembering these remarkable trailblazers is just one way to demonstrate not only our appreciation for their efforts but also to ensure that we continue to move forward in society.

While I believe that our fight is not over and that we must continue to address civil rights

issues; I am still in awe of the progress that has been made as the result of decades of work, diligence, sweat and tears of our country's civil rights trailblazers.

One century ago, today, Mrs. Parks was born in Tuskegee, Alabama. As many of you already know, on December 1, 1955 Mrs. Parks refused to give up her seat to a white passenger on a Montgomery city bus.

At that time in our nation's history as an African American woman in Montgomery, Alabama Mrs. Parks was actually risking her life by sitting in a seat that was denied to her because of the color of her skin. Although she knew she risked being beaten, insulted, bullied, and jailed that did not stop her from sitting down in order to stand up against injustice.

The arrest of Mrs. Parks led to the NAACP's boycott of the Montgomery, Alabama bus system. The boycott began on the first day of Mrs. Parks first court hearing on December 5, 1955, and did not end until December 20, 1956. It marks the first of many large-scale demonstrations against segregation.

For 381 consecutive days, men, women, and children stood up against injustice. In lieu of taking the bus, in many instances they elected to walk for miles to work, school, or for errands. Just for a moment envision that amount of dedication and commitment it takes in the hot days of a Alabama summer to opt to walk rather than take the bus for over a year.

Rose Parks by taking a seat was just the public spark needed to bring international attention to the civil rights movement and is in no small measure the genesis for the beginning of desegregation.

Again, because of the fearless actions of women and men, like Rosa Parks, the face of leadership in our nations is now more diverse than at any other point in our nation's history.

This change has been seen here within our own walls as well. Members of Congress are now a stew pot of races, ethnicities, cultures, sexual orientations, religions, and genders. This has only allowed us to have a diversity of perspective and has enabled us to better address the needs of our constituencies. Today, Congress in many ways reflects the America, what we represent.

The actions of Rosa Parks and thousands of other proud Americans and their supporters fueled the civil rights movement that advanced the principles upon which our nation was built. As I have stated before, although, we have come a long way we still have a long way to go. As we honor the life and legacy of Rosa Parks. As we reflect upon those who lost their lives standing up against injustice. As we celebrate what was almost unimaginable in 1955, the second inauguration of our nation's first African American President. We must also look again at our democracy and how in a time when we are making so many steps forward there is still an attempt to limit the votes of Americans. Given the progress that we have made as a result of the civil rights movement it is still incumbent upon each of us to continue to fight for the rights of all Americans. Recently, there have been systematic attempts to limit the rights of Americans to vote. Last year we celebrated the 47th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act, amid efforts by certain states to erode the right of Americans.

Today, most Americans take the right to vote for granted. We assume, as citizens of this fine Nation, that we can register to vote if we are over 18. Most of us learned in school that discrimination based on race, creed or national origin has been barred by the Constitution since the end of the Civil War. We celebrate moments like today, Rosa Parks birthday, that stands as a reminder of our Nation's honored and sometimes troubled past. Yet, at the time Rosa Parks sat down on that bus, the right to vote did not exist in practice for most African Americans. And, until 1975, most American citizens who were not proficient in English faced significant obstacles to voting, because they could not understand the ballot.

Even though the Indian Citizenship Act gave Native Americans the right to vote in 1924, state law determined who could actually vote, which effectively excluded many Native Americans from political participation for decades.

Asian Americans and Asian immigrants also have suffered systematic exclusion from the political process and it has taken a series of reforms, including repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1943, and passage of amendments strengthening the Voting Rights Act three decades later, to fully extend the franchise to Asian Americans.

It was with this history in mind that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was designed to make the right to vote a reality for all Americans. And the Voting Rights Act has made giant strides toward that goal. Without exaggeration, it has been one of the most effective civil rights laws passed by Congress.

In 1964, there were only approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress. Few, if any, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South.

The Voting Rights Act has opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the State or Federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress. And Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

We must not forget the importance of protecting this hard-earned right. I believe that the courage that Mrs. Parks displayed throughout her life helped shaped the United States. I believe that the courage she showed that day, changed our society. I believe that it is our duty to honor the Constitution and to honor the civil rights of all those who stand upon our shores. Today, as we celebrate the life of Rosa Parks, we must continue to push forward in ensuring that all those who have a right to a voice in our society have one. The right to vote is the great equalifyer, one person—one vote. Yet, there are those who are attempting to impinge that right by requiring the use of Voter ID cards. Now these photo ID proposals have a forceful momentum that have not seen in years past, as part of broader legislative movements to limit access to the political process for disenfranchised groups at a level not seen since post-reconstruction era laws that implemented poll taxes and literacy tests. In just over the first two months of 2011, photo ID proposals were introduced in 32 states and passed out of one legislative chamber in twelve states. Lawmakers across the Nation have pinpointed photo ID as a top legislative priority. The Governor of Texas designated photo ID as a legislative emergency in order to allow it to be procedurally fast-tracked through the legislature, photo ID proposals were pre-filed before legislative sessions began in half a dozen states, and secretaries of state in a number of states have listed photo ID as a top priority. I was pleased when the Department of Justice took action to stop that flowed piece of legislation.

Photo ID proposals have garnered significant momentum in more than a dozen states and opponents are having difficulty waging effective counterattacks to curb movement on these bills.

The time is now to stand up to protect the rights of the disenfranchised, the elderly, the disabled, and college student access to the right to vote. Now is the time, to remember the courage of those who participated in the bus boycott, recall their willingness to walk in the hot southern sun for over a year to stand up for their belief is justice, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Now is the time to truly honor the life of Rosa Parks, who by sitting down, stood up for justice. We must continue to move forward rather than backwards in this country. We must honor our past by standing up to protect every one's right to vote.

Today I remember Mrs. Parks for her courage and for everything she has done to advance civil rights movement. And to remember that although much progress has been made there remains much more to accomplish.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 2009, the day I took office, the national debt was $10,627,961,295,930.67.

Today, it is $16,480,910,656,603.96. We've added $5,852,949,360,673.29 to our debt in 4 years. This is a $5.8 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a Balanced Budget Amendment. We must stop this unconscionable accumulation of debt.

23RD ANNIVERSARY OF BLACK JANUARY

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 23rd anniversary of a tragic event in the history of the country of Azerbaijan.

On the night of January 19, 1990, Azerbaijan was invaded by thousands of Soviet troops. These troops entered Azerbaijan under the pretext of restoring public order, but with the true aim of ending peaceful demonstrations for independence.

Despite resistance to the Soviet troops by Azerbaijanis, more than 130 Azerbaijani people were killed and hundreds more were wounded or detained indefinitely. This episode came to be known as "Black January," a terrible event that only sharpened the desire for independence among the people of Azerbaijan.

By 1991, popular pressure had restored the independence of Azerbaijan. On August 30, 1991, Azerbaijan's Parliament adopted the Declaration on the Restoration of the State Independence of the Republic of Azerbaijan, and on October 18, 1991, the Constitutional Act on the State Independence of the Republic of Azerbaijan was approved. The United States established diplomatic relations with Azerbaijan in 1992. Since then, Azerbaijan has been a steadfast ally to the United States and an important strategic partner in the region.

Each year, the people of Azerbaijan remember those who lost their lives on Black January in 1990 and honor their sacrifice through their commitment to the ideals of democracy.

I urge my colleagues to commit to fostering a strong partnership between the United States and Azerbaijan so that together, we can promote freedom and democracy around the world.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF MIRIAM LAWLER

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate San Rafael, California, resident Miriam Lawler on the occasion of her 90th birthday on January 30, 2013.

Miriam Lawler is a native Californian, born in Los Angeles on January 30, 1923. She attended Santa Monica College and moved to San Francisco where she worked for the San Francisco Chronicle. Miriam went on to obtain her bachelor's degree from Dominican College and studied Spanish at the College of Marin.

During WWII, Miriam met William Lawler during his shore leave from his Navy destroyer. They married and settled in San Rafael, California, where she still lives today. Miriam has two sons: Martin and William Jr.

Always active in politics, Miriam worked on the presidential campaigns of Adlai Stevenson, John F. Kennedy, and Robert Kennedy. In Northern California, she also was involved in helping launch Clem Miller's successful congressional election. Throughout her life, Miriam has advocated for social justice and civil rights, has assisted children with learning disabilities, and has volunteered to help children learn to read.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, it is appropriate that we honor Miriam Lawler as she turns age 90 for her inspirational and prolonged civic engagement.

IMPORTANCE OF FUNDING IN MEDICAL RESEARCH FOR EPITHELIOID HEMANGIOENDOTHELIOMA AND OTHER DISEASES

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWKSY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss the importance of funding medical research for epithelioid hemangioendothelioma and other diseases. Epithelioid hemangioendothelioma, known simply as EHE, is a rare cancer affecting both men and women of all ages, causing disability, pain, and often death. The disease causes tumors in the endothelium, often affecting numerous organs at a time.

A study done by the American College of Chest Physicians states that EHE most often affects the lungs, liver, and bones, or a combination of these organs. Moreover, the disease causes a range of symptoms including pain, upper respiratory infections, bone fractures, weakness, and fatigue. The study also cites that while EHE is more common in women, men are more likely to die from it.

Currently, there is no effective treatment for EHE. The American College of Chest Physicians study states that EHE does not respond to chemotherapy and radiation as well as other cancers, causing many sufferers of the disease to resort to surgeries and organ transplants to try to relieve EHE's painful symptoms.

My constituent, Isaac Weinberg, is currently suffering from EHE. Because there is no cure for the disease, Isaac must have a liver transplant to alleviate some of the pain caused by it. Cutting medical research funding and limiting access to affordable healthcare would only hurt Isaac and other people suffering from EHE, as well as those suffering from other diseases.

However, providing funding for medical research would not only help those with EHE, but people with other diseases, as well. EHE is a sarcoma, a type of cancer that is very common. Therefore, research for EHE would be beneficial in finding effective treatments and cures for many different cancers and diseases, potentially helping thousands of people.

I want to thank my constituent and Isaac's father, Dr. Guy Weinberg, for establishing the Center for Research and Analysis of Vascular Tumors. CRAVAT provides desperately-needed research money dedicated to learning more about EHE. However, we cannot rely on private efforts alone. Federal funding is necessary if we are to make significant advances in discovering ways to treat, cure, and eliminate EHE and other diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring awareness to this important cause. Cutting medical research funding will hurt thousands of Americans suffering from diseases both rare and common, and we cannot allow that to happen. Instead, we must provide the crucial funding needed to research EHE and other diseases, allowing us to find cures, save lives, and help families like the Weinbergs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 32 on Motion to Suspend the Rules and pass H.R. 297, the Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2011. I was unable to vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 33 On Ordering the Previous Question (H. Res. 48). Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 7, 2013.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 69 public bills, H.R. 521–589; 2 private bills, H.R. 590–591; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 24–25; and H. Res. 56–61, were introduced. **Pages H410–14**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H416–17**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Require a PLAN Act: The House passed H.R. 444, to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, by a recorded vote of 253 ayes to 167 noes, Roll No. 38. **Pages H377–90, H391–94**

Rejected the Schwartz motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 37. **Pages H392–94**

Agreed to:

Fleming amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 113–8) that requires one of the additional policies presented in the supplemental budget to be an evaluation of duplicative agencies and proposals to consolidate them for cost-savings; **Page H388**

Messer amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 113–8) that requires the supplemental unified budget to include the cost, per taxpayer, of the annual deficit for each year in which such budget is projected to result in a deficit; and **Pages H388–89**

Scalise amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 113–8) that mirrors the House-passed Rules package by requiring the President's budget proposal to include a category for Means-Tested Direct Spending and Nonmeans-Tested Direct Spending, including average growth for each category. **Pages H389–90**

Rejected:

Takano amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 113–8) that sought to make changes to the findings section, clarifying that Congress holds responsibility for passing budgets and appropriating funds (by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 35) and **Pages H383–84, H391**

Schrader amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 113–8) that sought to add findings stating Simpson-Bowles created a balanced package of revenue and spending reforms which should form the basis for meeting the requirements of this act (by a recorded vote of 75 ayes to 348 noes, Roll No. 36). **Pages H384–88, H391–92**

H. Res. 48, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to yesterday, February 5th.

Recess: The House recessed at 10:47 a.m. and reconvened at 10:57 a.m. **Pages H390–91**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, February 8th; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, February 12th for morning hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business. **Page H398**

Commission on Long-Term Care—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority

Leader, in which she appointed the following individuals to the Commission on Long-Term Care: Bruce Allen Chernof of Los Angeles, CA; Judith Stein of Storrs, CT; and George Vradenburg of Washington, DC. **Page H406**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H391, H391–92, H393–94, and H394. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINING THE PROPER ROLE OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION IN MORTGAGE INSURANCE MARKET

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Proper Role of the Federal Housing Administration in Our Mortgage Insurance Market.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS: THE ROLE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''American Competitiveness: The Role of Research and Development.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense's response to the attack on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, and the findings of its internal review following the attack; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold an oversight hearing to examine implementation of Corps of Engineers water resources policies, 10:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine No Child Left Behind, focusing on early lessons from state flexibility waivers, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Robert E. Bacharach, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, William J. Kayatta, Jr., of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Richard Gary Taranto, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, Caitlin Joan Halligan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Patty Shwartz, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Pamela Ki Mai Chen, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, Katherine Polk Failla, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Andrew Patrick Gordon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, Ketanji Brown Jackson, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, Raymond P. Moore, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Troy L. Nunley, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, Beverly Reid O'Connell, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Analisa Torres, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Derrick Kahala Watson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii, and Mark A. Barnett, of Virginia, and Claire R. Kelly, of New York, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of John Owen Brennan, of Virginia, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, 2:30 p.m., SH–216.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 7

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 47, Violence Against Women Act. At 12 noon, Senator-designate Cowan, of Massachusetts, will be sworn in.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 a.m., Friday, February 8

House Chamber

Program for Friday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 11 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bonner, Jo, Ala., E109, E110
Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E105
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E104
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E110
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E112
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E105, E106
Costa, Jim, Calif., E110
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E104, E113
Edwards, Donna F., Md., E108
Enyart, William L., Ill., E104
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E108, E111
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E111
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E107, E108
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E109, E113
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E103, E111
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E112
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E103
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E103, E105
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E106
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E107
Neugebauer, Randy, Tex., E107
Owens, William L., N.Y., E111
Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E105
Poe, Ted, Tex., E109
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E111
Rogers, Harold, Ky., E110
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E106
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E104, E108, E113
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E105, E113
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E104

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.